are produced hand-in-hand. Protein occurs as a side product and even a main product of the fat production cycle. Protein is a sister to fat—soybean meal, and soybean oil; milk, and butterfat; pork, and lard. * * *

It is imperative that this relationship be recognized in guiding agricultural policy, because whatever seriously affects one affects the other.

From my observations I have come to some conclusions I wish to share with you. You may not agree, and if so I would welcome your views, for I am always searching for guidance on basic trends upon which policy decisions should be based. I certainly do not claim to be an expert, but evidence seems to support these conclusions:

1. This country is going to produce more, not less, fats and oils, both vegetable and animal. The soybean crop, in particular, is going to grow far beyond its present size—despite its already dramatic growth.

2. We are going to produce more protein, and feed it to livestock and poultry.

3. We can probably consume the added protein domestically in the form of meat, milk, and eggs, if we maintain an expanding economy and a rising standard of living for our own people.

4. But we are going to have to look to the rest of the world for additional outlets for fats and oils we produce beyond our own immediate needs.

All four points appear desirable, and worth encouraging as a matter of public policy.

Expansion of soybean production, for example, would mean diversion from corn and other feed grains now in surplus and result in shrinking the total feed supply from the same number of acres.

Dwindling of a feed grain surplus would result in our animal agriculture consuming more protein feed concentrate. It is probably true that today most farmers are not feeding enough protein to get the best results.

Almost all of our nutritional guidance points to encouraging more protein consumption in the human diet, and consumer preference for that protein is in the animal form of meat, milk, and eggs. Only the great civilizations have been able to maintain a relatively high level of animal protein consumption, and there is still ample opportunity for expanding our own.

But there are other areas of the world yet unable to achieve our level of animal protein consumption, areas that must exist on more basic forms of food energy. For many of these, more fats and oils are imperative to survival. As a result we not only have a potential outlet for our growing production—it is actually needed.

* * * * *

Many countries in the world today are definitely fat deficient, and many countries contain population groups who are fat deficient. History shows that a people deficient in calories—and that in practice means calories in the concentrated form called fat—either become too weak to carry on a strong nation, or, and this is very frequent in the history of our times, are easily provoked to aggression and internal disturbances.

This brings us right back to my earlier emphasis on the role our agriculture occupies in the world today.

I am not saying that the lack of fat or even of good nutrition is the mother of all wars—but I think it can be shown to be the cause of serious national problems.

What would happen if all margarine or butter disappeared in the United States? Something like that has happened to many people in other countries—and I have had high officials of foreign governments tell me personally that if it took their last dollar of foreign exchange, they had to get edible oils for their people to preserve political stability.

In many instances, the health and strength of these countries are vital to our own interests. Such countries include, for example, our NATO partners of Turkey and Italy, the Baghdad bloc, Spain, Japan, Vietnam, Formosa, Burma, India, Tunisia, and Morocco.

That is why I have encouraged expanded exports of fats and oils into these areas under Public Law 480. It has effectively served our own international policy's best interests and has strengthened the forces of freedom in the world. Yet if my conclusions about agricultural trends in this country are correct, it has also served the best interest of American agriculture, and it will be necessary to continue and expand such exports to maintain desirable shifts in our national food production.

* * * * *

I am aware that the margarine industry is interested almost wholly in the domestic market, but you have a stake in every trend that affects the fats and oil picture. The fact that we have enough to export—and have become the world's largest exporter of fats and oils while still providing adequate supplies for our own expanding population—assures you of a reliable supply of raw materials at reasonable price levels. Yet without the expanded export outlets for oils, price-depressing surpluses might result in reversing the entire trend of the present desirable shift into soybean production. Any short-range price benefit you might expect could well be offset by even higher costs resulting from shortages of the future if soybean production did not offer economic opportunities for farmers.

In my opinion, the time will come when you will be thinking more about the potential of markets abroad, as economic development results in higher living standards and greater purchasing power in many areas of the world. Eating habits are being formed and changed as these underdeveloped areas progress. In view of the pressing need for fats and oils in any form in many of these areas, might it not be sound to call upon you for a finished product as one means of putting soybean or cottonseed oils into this phase of the foreign field, as a part of our national foreign-aid policy? I do not suggest this as a benefit to the margarine industry, but as a useful form of foreign aid. It will not cure any problems you may have, but it may be a serviceable expression of our national interest in helping free countries fight off communism. Two of your principal ingredients—soybean oil and skim milk—are being handled as surpluses under the agricultural-assistance laws. There seems ample precedent for sending finished food fat goods overseas for welfare or foreign aid, in a form that might later pay dividends in market development through creating new eating habits.

* * * * *

Perhaps I have endeavored to cover too much ground in one talk today, in trying to look at food's role in the world along with domestic agricultural policy. Yet I feel they are closely interlocked.

It has been good to be with you. We still face many challenging problems regarding food and agriculture. Some of them are before us in Congress.

Of one thing you can be certain: Food is so essential to national life that I am sure Congress will always require safeguards in the public's interest in any farm policy. And, quite frankly, in my opinion the best safeguard the public can have of continued abundance is more willingness to see that the farmer gets a fair reward for his production.

I believe in abundance, not scarcity. I am convinced that farm people prefer to produce rather than to be forced to curtail production in order to achieve decent prices.

The challenge to our society is to find constructive and beneficial ways and means of using our abundance. We need to look upon our abundance as a national asset, not as an economic liability. You as food manufacturers have a real interest in abundant production. It would be against your own interest to force farmers to turn to artificial scarcity as a means of protecting their income.

For that reason, I suggest you soberly consider the alternative of current farm policy debates—and realize we all have a stake in strengthening our farm economy.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1958

*(Legislative day of Monday, March 17, 1958)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, New York, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Almighty God, this prayer we make to Thee on this anniversary of the declaration of independence of Byelorussia, whose freedom was mercilessly suppressed with brute, godless force, whose millions of martyrs before Thy throne cry to Thee: Exercise Thy justice, O Lord; restore freedom to the enslaved peoples of the world.

In this solemn moment we beg Thee, our God and Father, be gracious unto us. Thy mercy, Lord, is in the heavens and Thy truth reacheth unto the clouds, for Thou art great and doest wondrous things.

Merciful Father, Thou hast blessed the people of this country and helped them to establish a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Eternal God, bless the leaders of this country with Thy grace. Help them as they strive for Thy truth and as they strive for world liberty, so that all men, Thy children, may glorify Thee in their free countries.

We humbly implore Thee, our God and Redeemer, accept this our prayer: Bless the United States of America and Byelorussia.

May Thy glorious name, our God and Father, reign and shine in our hearts and be blessed now and forever. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 21, 1958, was dispensed with.

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 21, 1958,

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, on March 22, 1958, reported favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1407) thereon, which was printed.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, and that statements made in connection therewith shall be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], I ask unanimous consent that they may be granted leave of the Senate to be absent today. Both Senators are members of the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy, and are attending a meeting there today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate on official business from now until Wednesday morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may speak at this time for not to exceed 10 minutes, in connection with the announcement of the death of a Member of the other body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE SHANNON LONG

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, since the beginning of this session of the 85th Congress, six Members have died. The flags above this building are again at half mast.

This time it is to honor the memory of one of my dearest relatives, the late GEORGE SHANNON LONG, Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana.

On last Thursday, March 20, he and his wife were leaving their home for the office. It was necessary to shovel away some snow which was blocking the garage doors. While they were doing this, he suffered a heart attack, and was immediately taken to the Bethesda Naval Hospital. He seemed to be recovering; but, as so often seems to occur, 2 days later, on Saturday, March 22, he suffered a further coronary thrombosis, which proved fatal within a matter of minutes.

Representative LONG was born on September 11, 1883, in the farming community of Tunica, a few miles from Winnfield, La. He was the son of a small farmer, Huey Pierce Long, Sr. He was the second son in a family of nine.

He received his education in the public schools of Winn Parish and Mount Lebanon College. He qualified himself as a dentist in 1904. He moved to Tulsa, Okla., where he practiced his profession.

Like his brothers, he was always attracted to, and took an active part in, public affairs. While in Oklahoma, he served as a member of the Oklahoma State Legislature, and found time to qualify himself as a member of the Oklahoma bar in 1923. In 1935 he returned to Louisiana, to reestablish himself as a dentist. He settled at Pineville, La., where he also acquired a small farm.

His desire to serve in public capacity was again demonstrated. He twice ran unsuccessfully for a seat in the Congress, against a well-established Member of the House. His persistence was rewarded, however, when, in 1952, he was elected. He was reelected in 1954 by an overwhelming majority, and again in 1956.

He endeared himself to all those who knew him here in the Nation's Capital. I believe he was the most beloved member of the Louisiana Congressional delegation. Although he was a vigorous and forceful fighter in all the causes in which he believed, and gave no quarter to his opposition when the battle was on, he was characterized by friendliness, warmth, and Christian tolerance in his relationships with those around him.

Representative GEORGE LONG was one of the most faithful Members in his attendance at the sessions of the House of Representatives. For a time he never missed so much as a single quorum call. Nevertheless, he recognized that the crucial issue is, not how long a Member serves or how regularly he attends his committee meetings or the debates on the floor of the House, but whether he is working in the right direction.

During the debate over the pay raise for the Members of Congress, he made it clear that the public is perhaps incapable of completely rewarding its best public servants, and that any salary is too much to pay to one who is unworthy of service here. The following statement, which he made during the debate on the bill to increase the pay of Members of Congress, is in a large respect typical of his views of the requirements of public service:

> My opinion is that a lot of the Members who have spoken here today feel that they are not entitled to a salary raise. My advice to these Members would be, "Go back home and help elect to Congress a better man, to take your place; one who will be worth the money."

His service in the House of Representatives was in the best tradition of what most of us mean by the term Democrat. He was a constant, consistent, and unfailing battler for the poor, the distressed, and the unfortunate.

He served on the Veterans' Committee and he was always an advocate of a more adequate program to provide for the unfortunate veterans and for the widows of veterans. Members of the Congress will recall many battles he waged to prevent exploitation of the veterans' programs by unworthy persons, or other abuses resulting from unthinking bureaucratic procedures.

As a man born on the farm, and who lived near the farm all his life, and a small farmer himself, he was unfailing in his efforts to preserve in our American economy a worthy place for the small family farm.

His position on tax policies and on social security and housing legislation, demonstrated him to be the constant champion of the little man and the underdog.

GEORGE LONG was one of the most regular attenders at the quiet and unpublicized devotional breakfast which is held weekly in the restaurant of the House of Representatives. This little-known and inspired group came to know and love him, as they assembled to place themselves under God's guidance and to share their individual religious teachings and experiences.

Representative LONG was a member of the Baptist Church. He was a 32d degree Mason, a Shriner, and a Kiwanian.

He died at the age of 75, having led a rich, varied, and full life. He had the great satisfaction of having his life's work culminate in the opportunity for public service which he had sought so consistently throughout his life. This gave him the unusual opportunity of finding in his closing years his best and most active period of service.

He is survived by the one he cherished most while on this earth—his faithful and devoted wife, Jewell Tyson Long. He was married to her late in life. The marriage was an extremely happy one. His wife not only provided him with companionship and a wonderful home, but also continued to be his principal aid in his office and in other official capacities.

A brief memorial service will be held here in Washington today, at 4 p. m. The body will then be taken to Pineville, La., for the funeral services and interment on Thursday, March 27.

I should like to express my heartfelt appreciation to my colleagues from the Louisiana Congressional delegation, as well as to GEORGE'S many friends, who have come forward so promptly to give their sympathy and their assistance to the widow and to me, in this moment of sorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to associate myself with the very able Senator from Louisiana in the eloquent tribute he has paid to the late Representative GEORGE SHANNON LONG.

I did not know Representative LONG well, although I knew of his service, particularly of the very fine work he had performed in the field of veterans' affairs, in the field of aid to small farmers, and in connection with many other efforts on behalf of the American people.

Mr. President, the Long family has contributed many able and forceful leaders to our public life. They have worked for the benefit of their people in the light of their own convictions as to what would bring those benefits. And one of the outstanding members of the family is my good friend who represents Louisiana in this body.

When I heard of Representative LONG's unfortunate illness, I dictated to my secretary a note to go to him at the hospital. I will never forget the notes I received from my colleagues, when I went through a trying period with a similar ailment. But late Saturday afternoon my secretary brought the letter back to my desk, and said that Dr. LONG had died.

I join all the other Members of this body in expressing to Representative LONG's family our deep sympathy at his passing.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On behalf of the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle, I wish to join the distinguished majority leader in expressing both to the members of Representative LONG's family and to the State of Louisiana our regrets at his passing.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join my colleagues in expressing our deep sympathy on the passing of our colleague in the House, Representative GEORGE S. LONG, of Louisiana. As the Senator pointed out, he was the champion of the little man. His services will speak for themselves. To the junior Senator from Louisiana, and to the rest of Mr. LONG's family, we extend our deepest condolences and sympathy.

Mr. LONG. I am grateful to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is now in order.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were no significant developments relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, during the month of December, 1957; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on overobligations of appropriations in that Department (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the president, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank, covering the period July–December 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT PRIOR TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances, International Boundary and Water Commission, Department of State, dated June 21, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSALS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY, INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Director, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property by that Administration, covering the period January 1, 1957, through December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of January 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Resolution relative to harbors of refuge for small craft

"Whereas there is an urgent demand for harbors of refuge for fishing boats and other small craft along the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas the improvement and development of such harbors of refuge will be useful in augmenting the Nation's food supply by facilitating the further exploration of the food resources of the ocean by small craft, as well as providing harbor facilities and safe havens of refuge from storms for fishing fleets and other small craft; and

"Whereas such harbors of refuge will fill an urgent need of the United States Coast Guard in air and sea rescue endeavors, as well as providing harbor facilities for use of the Armed Forces in the event of hostilities; and

"Whereas in 1945 and 1946 the Congress of the United States authorized preliminary examinations and surveys with the view to the establishment of such harbors, which surveys were recommended by the United States Army Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas there are great stretches of the California coast which are at present devoid of harbors of refuge but along which coast are situated places adapted by nature to ready development at cost-to-benefit ratios amply justifying Congressional authorization and appropriation; and

"Whereas pursuant to the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated at Washington, D. C., March 22, 1948 (embodied in House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Doc. No. 644), the project known as Pillar Point breakwater on Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif., by action of the 80th Congress became, and ever since has been, an authorized project; and

"Whereas the San Francisco district engineer, having been furnished funds therefor, completed further studies and engineering data on said breakwater project, made his recommendation to the South Pacific division engineer of the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the general design memorandum about the month of January 1957, and which general design memorandum was thereafter approved by the Chief of Engineers in Washington in July 1957; and

"Whereas the Small Craft Harbors Commission, in the Department of Natural Resources of the State of California, at its meeting held in Redwood City, San Mateo County, Calif., on the 29th day of October 1957, after careful examination and study of the various reports and engineering data pertaining to the project, and after viewing the site, became convinced, and by resolution unanimously adopted, that the Pillar Point breakwater was of such authorized status and importance that it be given first priority—a classification for construction and completion as the first harbor of refuge south of San Francisco Bay, and thereby and therein urged the active support of Vice President Nixon, United States Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL and each California Representative in Congress to have included by the Bureau of the Budget an item of appropriation sufficient in amount to permit bids and letting of contracts for the construction of said project; and

"Whereas the members of the California Legislature have been informed that the Bureau of the Budget failed to include an item of appropriation for construction of the Pillar Point breakwater: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to augment or supplement the budget for the ensuing fiscal year by adding thereto an item of appropriation for construction of said Pillar Point breakwater; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Legislature of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to proceed forthwith and complete the preliminary examinations and surveys of other sites for harbors of refuge along the California coast, at intervals deemed adequate for the safety and protection of fishing fleets and other small craft; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting textile, fishing, and other historic industries

"Whereas His Excellency the Governor, in his annual message declared: 'Our textile and fishing industries have suffered greatly because of national and international policies which the national administration believes essential to the security of the Nation. I believe that it is unfair that these industries and their employees should be left to bear the adverse effects of national and international policies that have been adopted for the benefit of all citizens'; and

"Whereas other historic industries, deeply rooted in our economy and our traditions such as the shoe industry, have similarly suffered from the effect of national and international policies; and

"Whereas the Congress has recently and is now considering measures to alleviate the unfair losses imposed particularly upon the middle-aged and older workers of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

"Whereas Federal tax policies encourage speculators in industrial property to close up going plants rather than renovate and rebuild them, and thus constitute an additional barrier to the restoration of prosperity to our depressed industries: Therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States requesting that the Congress give early favorable consideration to legislation to alleviate the burdens on the textile, fishing, and other historic industries, and that the Congress modify Federal tax statutes in such a manner as to discourage owners from closing up economically valuable plants and factories; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted March 4, 1958.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk.*

"Senate, adopted in concurrence March 10, 1958.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

A resolution adopted by the Long Beach (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the repeal of the excise tax on transportation of property and passengers; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring the repeal of the telephone excise tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Commission of the City of Troy, Mich., favoring the repeal of the excise tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners, of Kauai County, T. H., favoring the establishment of a mining industry on the Island of Kauai; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Hawaii County, T. H., relating to fast water transportation services between the Hawaiian Islands; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Young Republicans of Essex County, N. J., relating to presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide the means and the Department of Agriculture to inaugurate a program to encourage and aid landowners to reseed and grow hardwoods on lands not adapted to pine trees.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide the means and the Department of Agriculture to inaugurate a program to encourage and aid landowners to reseed and grow hardwoods on lands not adapted to pine trees

*Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring),* That the attention of the Congress of the United States is called to a practice which now obtains in this State, and presumably in other States whose lands are adapted to the growth of hardwoods, that the conservation reserve program does not foster the planting and growing of hardwood trees, as is done in the case of pine trees. It is well known that the Department of Agriculture is placing great emphasis on the practice of planting and growing of pine trees, a most commendable practice. But there are vast areas in this State in which the water table is too high to grow pine trees. These areas, however, are well adapted to the growth of poplar, gum, maple, and other trees which flourish in soils too wet to grow pine trees.

We take it that it is not necessary to invite the attention of the Congress to the fact that the hardwoods are very essential to many useful industries. They are used in making plywood, in the manufacture of automobiles, buildings, airplanes, and many other uses too numerous to mention. And so we memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide the means and the Department of Agriculture to inaugurate a program that will encourage and aid landowners in reseeding and planting hardwood trees in certain arcas. During the recession, a program of this type would provide profitable employment to thousands of people now out of work, and at the same time, would, in the years to come, provide a source of national wealth that would make a very definite contribution to the economy of our Nation; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Senators from this State, and the Members of the House of Representatives in Congress.

---

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, one of the main reasons why our country has been successful in defeating all those who have attacked us has been the effective work of the citizen-soldier, who follows a gainful business or profession in peacetime, and yet is available for immediate mobilization during time of war or other real emergency.

An outstanding example of this citizen-soldier is Maj. Gen. Alexander G. Paxton, of Greenville, Miss., and the Mississippi National Guard, who will retire on July 1, this year, after many years of faithful and outstanding service to his State and the Nation. Let those who need assurance of the necessity of maintaining a strong National Guard follow his record of service through World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. He has served with great personal sacrifice and outstanding ability during these periods of national peril, and I pay tribute to him as an outstanding Mississippian and a great American. His record of achievement has been the record of battle-success of the famed 31st "Dixie" Division, which has served with distinction all over the world, for it is General Paxton who has led this historic division.

Mr. President, Maj. Gen. Alexander Paxton deserves the appreciation of a grateful country for his ability, leadership and patriotism. His outstanding record is proof indeed of the necessity for the continuation of the work of the citizen-soldier and a strong National Guard.

The Mississippi Legislature has adopted a resolution in recognition of his outstanding service, and I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 133

Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi expressing the appreciation of the State of Mississippi to Maj. Gen. Alexander G. Paxton, commanding general of the 31st Infantry Division, on the eve of his retirement from the Mississippi National Guard

Whereas for many years the State of Mississippi and the Nation have benefited by Maj. Gen. Alexander G. Paxton's great ability and outstanding talent, and the contribution he has made in helping maintain this State and Nation strong and free from oppression; and

Whereas General Paxton during the periods of conflict of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war has with great personal sacrifice laid aside the duties and cares of his civilian vocation and willingly heeded the call of his State and Nation to serve in their defense with great honor and distinction; and

Whereas General Paxton through his exemplary leadership has led the famed 31st Dixie Division with the efficiency and devotion to duty required to maintain that organization as one of this Nation's finest, and in keeping with that division's historic heritage; and

Whereas in peace and war the achievements of General Paxton as a member of the Mississippi National Guard have been a source of strength and aid to the National Guard and of immeasurable value to the people of this State: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein),* That by the adoption of this resolution we express the appreciation of the State of Mississippi to Maj. Gen. Alexander G. Paxton for his devoted service to this State and to its people; be it further

*Resolved,* That there be presented in suitable official form an enrolled copy of this resolution to Maj. Gen. Alexander G. Paxton, and further that copies be sent to the representatives of the press.

## PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present a series of resolutions adopted by the local Farmers' Union of Floodwood, Minn., the Atwater Creamery Co., of Atwater, Minn., the Floodwood Cooperative Creamery Association, of Floodwood, Minn., and the Redwing, Minn., local of the Farmers' Union, relating to price supports for dairy products. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOODWOOD, MINN., *March 20, 1958.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
*Senator from Minnesota,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR THYE: Resolution passed in our local Farmers Union meeting held in co-op clubrooms at Floodwood, Minn., March 18, 1958, 8 p. m.

Whereas the dairy industry is one of the major industries in the whole Arrowhead area of Minnesota, also Floodwood, Minn.

If the support prices are lowered to 75 percent of parity that means over $900,000 loss in income for Arrowhead area farmers. That means so much and more loss in business, also on urban territory.

Whereas even present support prices in parity for dairy products are already too low to make prosperity for dairy farmer. So we are strongly opposed or against the lowering support prices for dairy products down to 75 percent of parity.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK O. LUOMA,
*Secretary.*

---

ATWATER CREAMERY CO.,
*Atwater, Minn., March 17, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR THYE: Enclosed is a photograph of the members of the Atwater Creamery Co., of Atwater, Minn., at the 67th annual meeting of the cooperative held the 15th day of February 1958. The members are shown voting in favor of the following resolution:

"1. That the farmers of the country have been more and more exposed to the harsh and pitiless program of elements that have tried and are trying to drive prices of agricultural products to the ground.

"2. That the newest drive against the farmer is the order of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson cutting dairy price supports.

"3. That a strong, stable agriculture is necessary for a healthy economy and that a healthy agricultural economy requires the protection of price through firm price supports.

"4. That Secretary Benson's order shoves a knife in the back of the farmer farming the individualized, family-sized farm which is the backbone of agriculture and the Nation's economy: Therefore, we assembled in our annual meeting, resolve as follows:

"1. That we urge all farm State legislators to support the bills introduced by Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and EDWARD J. THYE providing for dairy price supports at 75 to 90 percent of parity using a parity equivalent based on the 30-month period July 1946, to December 1948, and for a support price of not less than $3.50 per hundredweight for the marketing year beginning April 1.

"2. That the campaign of Secretary Benson against dairy price supports and against the farmers of the Nation be deplored."

Sincerely,

FRITZ KRAGENBRING,
*Chairman, Atwater Creamery Co.*

---

FLOODWOOD COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
*Floodwood, Minn., March 21, 1958.*

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously passed at a district meeting of the Arrowhead Cooperative Creamery Association held at the Floodwood Community Hall on March 20, 1958:

"Whereas the dairy industry is the only industry in this area of any consequence and a drop in support price to 75 percent of parity would mean a loss of annual income in this area of over $1 million to farmers and business places; and

"Whereas even the present dairy support price of 82 percent of parity is too low to enable the dairy farmer of this area to prosper: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the 300 members present at this meeting were strongly opposed to the lowering of dairy price supports to 75 percent of parity as proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture."

FRANK A. GUOMA,
*Secretary.*

---

Whereas agriculture is a major industry in this community and in Minnesota; and

Whereas the lowering of farm supports on dairy products, wheat, corn, and the feed grains would create increased hardship in our area; and

Whereas price protection is needed on livestock and poultry because these products make up a large percentage of the cash farm income of this community; and

Whereas the community is losing millions of dollars in income and purchasing power each year because farmers are not receiving prices which give them a return equal to the cost of production and living; and

Whereas the farm credit situation is serious and capital is lacking both to finance 1958 operations and to make the needed repairs and replacements on the farm; and

Whereas the lack of farm buying power is holding back a large volume of purchases, repairs, and investment in new buildings and machinery, which contribute in turn to a drop in business activity and employment in the city: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That we, the Red Wing local of the Farmers Union, urge the Congress to take into consideration that the best and most direct method of forestalling the growing business recession and aiding small business in our community, would be to take immediate steps to restore farm prices to a full parity level; be it further

*Resolved,* That the Congress be urged to oppose the recommendations for still lower farm price-support levels, and instead to approve measures which will restore farm prices to a higher level at which the sale of farm products will give farmers a fair purchasing power; and be it finally

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to our Members of the House and Senate in the Congress and to other interested officials.

Dated at Red Wing, Minn., March 18, 1958.

GEORGE ARNDT,
*Vice President.*

Mrs. ANGELINE GERMANN,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

## RESOLUTION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL OF BUHL, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the village council of the village of Buhl, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for a public-works program in the vicinity of Buhl. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas a serious unemployment and unstable economic situation exists in our immediate area and the Mesabi Iron Range, wtih hundreds of iron ore miners unemployed and many more to be laid off as time goes on; and

"Whereas this serious situation has created undue hardship and suffering upon these unemployed and their families: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the village council of the village of Buhl, Minn., request the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate Federal funds and aid for a public-works program in this area affected by this serious unemployment situation and thus help relieve the undue hardship of these unemployed and their families, and to effectuate the securing of the same."

Copies of this resolution to be sent to Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, Congressman from our district, Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY and Hon. EDWARD THYE, United States Senators from Minnesota.

Moved by Clerk Turnquist, seconded by Trustee Simonson that the foregoing resolution be adopted as read.

It was declared adopted by the following vote: Ayes—Trustees Simonson, Roberts; Clerk Turnquist, Mayor Anderson; nays—none.

Dated at Buhl, Minn., this 17th day of March 1958.

JOHN L. ANDERSON,
*Mayor.*

Attest:

JOHN D. TURNQUIST,
*Clerk.*

---

## RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF WILD RICE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the board of directors of Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., has recently adopted a resolution opposing increased rates for REA.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A motion was made by G. E. Gunnarson to adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the directors of Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., that a proposed increase in the interest rates charged is proposed; and

"Whereas many co-ops could not survive any rate increase: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the directors of Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., wholeheartedly oppose any such increase; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Minnesota."

Mr. R. P. Schnell seconded said motion and the same being put to a vote the resolution was unanimously adopted. Motion carried.

## RESOLUTION OF BERTHA (MINN.) COMMERCIAL CLUB

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 17, 1958, the Bertha Commercial Club unanimously adopted a resolution urging that the Congress maintain the present rate of dairy support.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERTHA COMMERCIAL CLUB,
*Bertha, Minn.*

"Whereas the dairy industry is one of the major industries in Minnesota and the Bertha area; and

"Whereas the price supports on dairy products is scheduled to drop on April 1 to 75 percent, the basic minimum; and

"Whereas the economic effect would be a considerable loss to our dairy farmers and to our entire area: be it

*"Resolved,* That the Bertha Commercial Club urges your continued effort, as a temporary measure, to maintain the present rate of dairy support; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and to Congressman FRED MARSHALL."

The above resolution was presented at the Bertha Commercial Club meeting on March 17, 1958, and was approved unanimously.

S. O. STOCK,
*Secretary.*
MORRIS F. BAILEY,
*President.*

## RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of the resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., urging the Federal Government to speed up public works projects to help counteract the economic recession.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 190

Whereas the United States of America is now in the midst of an economic recession to the extent that the Congress of the United States has become greatly concerned; and

Whereas curtailment of steel and wood products manufacture has affected northeastern Minnesota, especially St. Louis, Lake, and Cook Counties to the extent that a large number of residents are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the United States Forest Service, through the Department of Interior, is hereby requested to extend the Ely-Buyck Road to at least as far as Big Lake in St. Louis County;

*Resolved further,* That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to allocate additional funds to the United States Forest Service for projects in their recreational and forestry management program;

*Resolver further,* That the United States Forest Service is hereby requested to commence at once, wherever practical, any projects which they have under consideration for the year 1958.

Commissioner Ahola moved the adoption of the resolution and it was declared adopted upon the following vote: Yeas, Commissioners McKeever, Solem, Theobald, Ahola, Ostdahl, and Chairman Hultstrand, 6; nays, none.

J. L. PERRY,
*Clerk of County Board.*

## RESOLUTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF BUHL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Public Utilities Commission of Buhl, Minn., has recently adopted a resolution urging Congress to appropriate Federal funds and aid for public-works programs in the area around the Mesabi Iron Range where there is a serious unemployment problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas a serious unemployment and unstable economic situation exists in our immediate area and the Mesabi Iron Range, with hundreds of iron ore miners unemployed and many more to be laid off as time goes on; and

"Whereas this serious situation has created undo hardship and suffering upon these unemployed and their families: Now, therefore, be and it hereby is

*"Resolved,* That the Public Utilities Commission of the Village of Buhl, Minn., request the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate Federal funds and aid for a public-works program in this area affected by this serious unemployment situation and thus help relieve the undo hardship of these unemployed and their families; and to effectuate the securing of the same, copies of this resolution will be sent to the Honorable Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, the Honorable Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, and the Honorable Senator EDWARD THYE."

Secretary N. J. Mollaro moved the adoption of the foregoing resolution and upon support thereof by Commissioner M. J. Klarich, the same was adopted and so declared at a duly called meeting held March 18, 1958, by the following vote: Ayes, 3; nays, 0.

PETER STONEBRUCH,
*Chairman.*
Attest:
N. J. MOLLARO,
*Secretary.*

## RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, HASTINGS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the City Council of the City of Hastings, Minn., has recently adopted a resolution urging that the National Guard continue to be maintained at the highest possible strength and state of readiness.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HASTINGS, MINN., *March 19, 1958.*

*Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Hastings, Minn.,* That the Congressmen and Representatives of Minnesota be urged to oppose legislation of which committee hearings are now being conducted by the House Armed Services Committee.

It is the belief of this body that the National Guard should be maintained at the highest possible strength and state of readiness so that mobilization delays will be reduced to a minimum.

We further believe that a strong, well-trained and well-equipped active service, backed by a strong National Guard, is essential to our national security and that it would be dangerous economy to carry out the present forced reductions in strength of the National Guard.

Adopted by the city council this 17th day of March 1958.

WALLACE H. ERICKSON,
*Mayor.*
Attest:
ADOLPH J. GERGEN,
*City Clerk.*

## LETTER FROM INTERNATIONAL HOD CARRIERS AND CONSTRUCTION LABORERS LOCAL 1097, VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the International Hod Carriers and Construction Laborers Local, No. 1097, Virginia, Minn., has just sent me a letter informing me of the resolution adopted by the local urging an additional 16 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits out of Federal funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL HOD CARRIERS AND CONSTRUCTION LABORERS LOCAL, No. 1097,
*Virginia, Minn., March 21, 1958.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
*Senate Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: This organization, local 1097, construction and common laborer union, of Virginia, Minn., covering three counties in northern Minnesota, at its regular meeting of March 13, 1958, voted to go on record as to asking your wholehearted support in any bill which would add an additional 16 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits out of Federal funds.

In this local we have over 500 members out of work, many since early fall, and are at or coming to the end of their regular unemployment compensation benefits.

Yours truly,

A. W. PRYOR,
*Business Representative.*

## RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the City Council of the City of Virginia, Minn., adopted a resolution at its meeting on March 18, 1958, calling upon Congress to increase public works and other benefits to provide economic assistance in their immediate area to combat the serious unemployment situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 6611

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia,* That—

Whereas the unemployment situation throughout the country has become increasingly critical and many varied plans have been discussed in Congress to alleviate this situation; and

Whereas the adverse effects of the Nation's economy have been immediately felt in this area as steel production has decreased: Be it hereby

*Resolved,* That the city of Virginia and its surrounding area urgently request immediate action be taken to provide a system of public works or other benefits to provide economic assistance to this area, whether a part of a national program for the entire country or some form of action giving special assistance to promote the mining of local Minnesota iron ores.

Moved by Alderman Virshek, supported by Alderman Thomas, that the above resolution be adopted.

Ayes: Aldermen Thomas, Virshek, Luodo, Vukelich, Glatz, McKenzie, Maki, President Stock—8; nays, none.

Adopted March 18, 1958.

ARTHUR J. STOCK,
*President of the City Council.*
JOHN VUKELICH,
*Mayor.*

Attest:

J. G. MILROY, Jr.,
*City Clerk.*

## RESOLUTION OF CURRIE, MINN., BOOSTERS FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a resolution adopted by the Currie Boosters Farmers Union Local urging Congress to take immediate steps to restore farm prices to a full parity level.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas agriculture is a major industry in this community and in Minnesota; and

Whereas the lowering of farm supports on dairy products, wheat, corn, and the feed grains would create increased hardship in our area; and

Whereas price protection is needed on livestock and poultry because these products make up a large percentage of the cash farm income of this community; and

Whereas the community is losing millions of dollars in income and purchasing power each year because farmers are not receiving prices which give them a return equal to the cost of production and living; and

Whereas the farm credit situation is serious and capital is lacking both to finance 1958 operations and to make the needed repairs and replacements on the farm; and

Whereas the lack of farm buying power is holding back a large volume of purchases, repairs, and investment in new buildings and machinery, which contribute in turn to a drop in business activity and employment in the city: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That we, the Currie Boosters Farmers Union, urge the Congress to take into consideration that the best and most direct method of forestalling the growing business recession and aiding small business in our community would be to take immediate steps to restore farm prices to a full parity level; be it further

*Resolved,* That the Congress be urged to oppose the recommendations for still lower farm price support levels, and instead to approve measures which will restore farm prices to a higher level at which the sale of farm products will give farmers a fair purchasing power; and be it finally

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to our Members of the House and Senate in the Congress and to other interested officials.

Dated at Currie Booster Local, Minnesota, March 19, 1958.

HERMAN ZENS,
*Chairman.*
AGNES MICKELSON,
*Secretary.*

## RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by organizations in the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Air Force has stated that its No. 1 problem is retention of skilled personnel and this same problem exists in the other services; and

Whereas a committee headed by Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric, has proposed a modernized military pay system based upon accepted methods of American industry and designed to aid the military services to reward and retain skilled individuals in critical jobs; and

Whereas it has been estimated that if adopted the Cordiner Committee's recommendations would eventually save $5 billion annually in training costs and at the same time substantially increase the striking power of our military forces: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Greene County Board of Supervisors does unanimously urge the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation containing the recommendations of the Cordiner Committee; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable IRVING S. IVES, United States Senator; to the Honorable JACOB JAVITS, United States Senator; and to the Honorable J. ERNEST WHARTON, Member of the House of Representatives.

---

Whereas it is our belief that immediate measures be taken to assist in combating any depression or recession; and

Whereas it is our belief that the most rapid and beneficial measures can and should be taken at the local community level, with the assistance of the State and Federal Governments; and

Whereas it is our belief that if all local communities institute a program of public works, with the assistance of the State and Federal Governments, a depression can be averted and a recession halted; and

Whereas we have endeavored to evolve a plan for such assistance, which plan is incorporated in this resolution; and

Whereas it is our desire to place this plan before the appropriate governmental authorities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That this council petition the State and Federal Governments for assistance in public works undertakings for this community and for all other communities similarly situated, which public works are to be undertaken as soon as practicable and as soon as permissible under present existing law.

That this community undertake a program of constructing the following: A sewage disposal plant, an incinerator, construct storm sewer drainage wherever needed, repave necessary streets throughout the city, construct a municipal office building, construct a municipal recreation building.

That this community pay one-third of the cost thereof, the State government pay one-third the cost thereof, the Federal Government pay one-third the cost thereof.

That since it will be necessary to issue bonds for the payment of these public works, that this community pay one-third of the interest charges on such bond issue, that the State government pay one-third of such interest cost on such bond issue and that the Federal Government pay one-third of such interest cost, such payments to be made annually.

That since it is our belief that many local communities hesitate to enter into a program of public works because of the necessary and continued interest charges on bond issues for the payment of such public works, we suggest, as above, that the interest charges be divided equally between the local community, State government and Federal Government.

It it our belief that if this method of financing public works be adopted for usage throughout the country, then immediate assistance can be rendered to the national economy and the burden of paying for such program can be equitably assessed throughout the Nation; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of New York and our Representatives in Congress for appropriate legislation and action.

Whereas the current recession has had a severe effect on the economy of Westchester County; and

Whereas jobless-insurance claims for January and February 1958 are 40 percent over the same period in 1957 and registered unemployment is presently over 15,000, the highest since 1940; and

Whereas unemployment in New York State continues to climb and industrial production continues to fall; and

Whereas the rate of personal and corporate taxation is at the highest point in history: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That we request that Congress take prompt and forceful action to curtail the growing speed and gravity of the current decline and to further adopt measures which will insure relative stability of our economy; and be it further

*Resolved,* That every consideration should be given to effecting an immediate and substantial personal and corporate tax cut. Such a tax cut on personal income at this time would create billions in increased purchasing power which would stimulate sales and production and, consequently, revive our faltering economy. A reduction of taxes on corporate income will tend to reduce the profit squeeze and therefore enable business to invest additional moneys in capital expenditures—plant expansion, new machinery, and so forth which will also tend to revitalize our economy.

It is our firm belief that our present economic condition is due in a large part to the excessively high corporation and personal income taxes.

In addition to the compelling social reasons for a healthy economy, it is our strong belief that a vital, healthy national economy is our greatest weapon of defense.

## PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring the

enactment of the bill (S. 582) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages. I ask unanimous consent that the petition may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We urge you to use your power to get through the Senate bill S. 582—LANGER, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages. Thanks.

(Signed by Mrs. Melvin Donner, and 32 other citizens of the State of New York.)

## PROHIBITION OF SERVING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON COMMERCIAL AND MILITARY PLANES—PETITION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the bills (S. 4) and (S. 593) to prohibit serving of alcoholic beverages on commercial and military planes. I ask unanimous consent that the petition may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We urge you to use your powers to get through the Senate one of the bills, S. 4 and S. 593, to prohibit serving of alcoholic beverages on commercial and military planes. Thanking you, we are

(Signed by Mrs. Melvin Donner and 34 other citizens of the State of New York.)

## RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS UNION JOBBING ASSOCIATION, OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Farmers Union Jobbing Association, of Kansas City, Mo., at its annual meeting on March 2, 1958, adopted several resolutions, including one which stresses the importance of research projects carried on by various institutions in the interest of agriculture.

These research projects further include projects not only dealing with the improvement of farm crops, but also studying the benefits of marketing in our domestic and export markets.

I want to call these resolutions to the attention of the Senate and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Farmers Union Jobbing Association, a regional cooperative association, owned by 240 local cooperatives, representing 75,000 farmer members, meeting at its 44th annual meeting this 12th day of March 1958, hereby recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

We commend the board of directors, management and employees for their effort in completing a very successful business year and the very forward reaching expansion program now being carried out.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

We commend the association for their cooperation and support of the Kansas Cooperative Council, the Kansas Farmers Union and the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations. We urge this support and cooperation be continued.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

We endorse and support the establishment and continuance of the Midwest Cooperative Conference, a voluntary association of regional cooperatives to express the attitudes of farmer cooperatives on farm problems and the inauguration of self-help programs through cooperatives to assist farmers to obtain a more equitable share of the national income. We are especially proud of the part our general manager took in the establishment of this conference as we feel it brought the voice and strength of cooperatives to the forefront in dealing with farmers' problems.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

We endorse the research projects being conducted in cooperation with various land-grant colleges, for the purpose of gathering statistical information as an approach to a voluntary self-help program through cooperation, for agricultural price supports and production controls.

We also endorse the research and investigation carried on by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives on an export program. We urge our association to give financial and moral support to these projects.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

We believe the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, composed of all the regional marketing cooperatives, of which our association is a member, is doing an excellent job of uniting all regional cooperatives into a common front in Washington. We urge our association to continue its membership and support of the federation.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

The National Federation of Grain Cooperatives holds a spring conference each year in Washington. We commend the board of directors and management for their effort in getting managers of local and regional cooperatives to attend this conference. We urge this practice be continued.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

We believe that the Congress should make a public declaration of national policy to encourage, promote, and finance farmer cooperatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

We believe that the objective of agricultural parity is sound and fair; therefore, we support the action of Congressional leaders in their attempt to freeze the price supports at the 1957 levels.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

These resolutions shall become a part of the minutes of this annual meeting and we direct that copies thereof shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congressional delegations of Kansas and Missouri.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1697. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1409); and

S. 1748. A bill to add certain lands located in Idaho and Wyoming to the Caribou and Targhee National Forests (Rept. No. 1408).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1507. A bill for the relief of Aly Wassil (Rept. No. 1410);

S. 2564. A bill for the relief of Sabina Skalar (Rept. No. 1411);

S. 2638. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Christos Soulis (Rept. No. 1412);

S. 2794. A bill for the relief of Letteria Morganti (Rept. No. 1413); and

S. 2841. A bill for the relief of Karl Weinheimer (Rept. No. 1414).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2665. A bill for the relief of Jean Kouyoumdjian (Rept. No. 1415).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 3050. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1416).

## REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Oliver D. Hamlin, Jr., of California, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice William Denman, retired;

Donald E. Kelley, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado;

Pervie Lee Dodd, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama;

Tom Kimball, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado; and

George A. Colbath, of New Hampshire, to be United States marshal for the district of New Hampshire.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 3544. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3545. A bill for the relief of John F. Sheehan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3546. A bill for the relief of Donald Herbert French; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3547. A bill for the relief of Andrejs Pablo Mierkalns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. IVES, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 3548. A bill to authorize additional funds for urban renewal projects under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3549. A bill to amend part III of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to exempt from the provisions of such part certain vessels navigating on Chesapeake Bay or the Potomac River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMATHERS (by request):

S. 3550. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by adding thereto a new part V, to provide for a temporary program of assistance to enable common carriers subject to such act to finance improvements and developments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## RESOLUTIONS

### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF INTERIM REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at this time I submit a resolution for appropriate reference.

The resolution, Mr. President, would authorize the printing of an additional 2,500 copies of the select committee's report. I believe we received 1,500 copies without any resolution for additional. If the resolution is approved, that will allow us 4,000 copies of the report.

Mr. President, this is a comparatively large report, as can be appreciated, but I might say that requests are already coming in for copies of the report. In my judgment, 4,000 copies of the report will not begin to accommodate the requests that we shall receive.

I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration will promptly act on the resolution and report it favorably, so that the requested additional copies of the report may be printed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I can assure the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that 4,000 copies will not begin to meet the demands for the report. I would urge that he ask for more than the number he is now requesting.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have made this request because I understand that additional copies can be obtained by future requests, if authorized by the Senate. I do think serious consideration should be given, and I shall confer with my colleagues on the committee tomorrow, to obtaining additional copies. I think the demand will be tremendous. The report will be something worth reading, something in which the people of this country are interested. There will be a demand for the report, and the information contained in the report ought to be disseminated to all American citizens. There is something vital that is involved, something that is of concern to all in this country, and something that we need to be informed about.

I believe the report will stimulate an interest that will result in support of the Congress. I am talking about grassroots sentiment that will support the Congress in rising to the responsibility that is incumbent upon it to approve legislation in the areas where it is needed to protect the working people of this country, to protect labor, to protect management, and to protect the interest and welfare of the general public.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to identify myself with the remarks made by the distinguished minority leader in complimenting the chairman of the committee for the wonderful work being done, and, as the minority leader said, work I hope will continue to be done. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, am I correct in my assumption that the legislation the Senator expects to propose will be referred to our committee for hearings?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is eminently correct. The select committee can only recommend; it has no legislative function. Any bills proposed by the select committee, and the one I shall introduce, of course, will be referred to the Senator's committee, where further testimony on it may be heard, and the measure evaluated on its merits. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a legislative committee; the select committee is an investigating committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is what I had understood. I thank the Senator for that information. I again congratulate him for the splendid job he and the committee have done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 279), submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field 2,500 additional copies of the committee's interim report to the Senate pursuant to Senate Resolutions 74 and 221, 85th Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 280) relative to the death of Hon. GEORGE S. LONG, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ELLENDER, which appears under a separate heading.)

### AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the dean of the Republican Senators, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I are today introducing a bill identical to H. R. 11001, recently introduced in the other body by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, and the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY.

This bill would effect a long overdue improvement in our defense organization. Essentially, this would be achieved under the bill's provisions by correcting the weak portions of our defense organization and strengthening that which has proved successful.

Passage of this bill will provide efficiency, reality, economy, and common sense in the organization and functioning of the Department of Defense.

I have come to the conclusion that Congressional admonitions and legislative restraints will not stop the growth of the bureaucracy that has grown so rapidly since the Office of the Secretary of Defense was established in the National Security Act of 1947.

At that time it was envisioned that the Secretary of Defense would exercise broad coordination over the military departments.

The following will indicate how far defense organization has strayed from what was intended by Congress when it passed the National Security Act of 1947. One of the authors of that proposal, the late Adm. Forrest Sherman, testified:

> The Secretary of National Defense should have a small executive office for directing and controlling the Defense Establishment.
>
> In addition to the 4 assistants provided by section 104 I believe he could accomplish his mission with about 100 people, including stenographic personnel and file clerks.

I should like to point out that that small executive office of about 100 people has become an administrative jungle of what is conservatively estimated to be about 2,400 civilian employees, plus the assigned military officers and enlisted personnel. This bureaucratic hierarchy includes assistant secretaries, deputies to assistant secretaries, and assistants to assistant secretaries.

The late James Forrestal testified that it was his expectation that if the Office of Secretary of Defense were established it would "exercise overall direction but not go down into the departments themselves and deal with their functions, daily operations and administration."

What is going on today, and what is impeding and impairing our national security, is that the direct reverse of Mr. Forrestal's expectations has taken place. Today the vast array of functionaries, upon whom finally rests the power so necessarily delegated by the Secretary of Defense, interferes directly with the activities and affairs of the military departments.

The bill will place a limit of 600 civilian employees in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It will eliminate 14 of the present Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Defense, bringing it to a reasonable total of 15 Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.

The dangers to national security resulting from the overconcentration of power and functions at the top level of the Pentagon is not limited to the civilian bureaucracy.

One of the most alarming developments since World War II has been the gradual but continuing movement toward a single chief of staff and a supreme general staff after the German pattern.

Our Joint Chiefs of Staff system is the strongest insurance against the militarily and politically dangerous supreme staff concept. The bill improves and strengthens our war-proven Joint Chiefs of Staff system. It does this in two respects: First, by giving the JCS, as a corporate body, authority not only to establish unified commands, but also authority over assignment and withdrawal of forces in the unified commands, designation of boundaries between them and coordination between these unified commands; second, by providing legal encouragement and authority for the members of the JCS, who are also the uniformed chiefs of their respective services, to delegate, subject to the approval of their Department Secretaries, administrative details concerning their services.

This in no way—legal or de facto—separates the JCS members from their position as uniformed chiefs of their services. There must be no infringement of the unity of JCS membership and service command which provides reality in the military planning and avoids ivory tower theorizing.

Also, I should like to invite attention to that portion of the bill which restricts, in peacetime, tours of duty in the Joint Staff to a maximum of 3 years. The Joint Staff, by the very nature of its position in the Department, and its relationship with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, could well develop into a supreme high command. Such a development would be the natural result of giving the Joint Staff operational function and authority. Significantly, the bill does not authorize any such dangerous increase in the authority or functions of the Joint Staff.

I believe that a real increase in efficiency in strategic planning will result from that provision of the bill which makes the Secretaries of the military departments regular members of the National Security Council. One of the most unfortunate trends in defense organization in recent years has been the constant erosion in the status and role of the Secretaries of the military departments. In the final analysis, it is the military departments with their uniformed services which are the agencies for finally getting things done. The Secretaries of the military departments have responsibilities of such vast scope and strategic importance and they possess such knowledge of military realities that they can, I believe, contribute greatly to the formulation of policy by the National Security Council. Their membership in the National Security Council will be at least one step in the long overdue process of restoring the much justified prestige and status that must be accorded their position.

This bill will do much to preserve the ability of the Congress and the public to have access to accurate information on military affairs. We can be sure that when the Pentagon reorganization proposals are forwarded to the Congress the Pentagon's censorship and public information machine will accompany them with a barrage of publicity designed to make a quick sale of the proposition.

This bill provides that the Congress shall continue to exercise its constitutional function of prescribing the basic roles and missions of the armed services. Those who have claimed that modern technology has made the present roles and missions competitive, would cure the alleged defect by handing the constitutional function of the Congress to an appointed official in the Pentagon. The alleged defect, of course, is nonsense. There is no competition, for instance, between the role of the Army to provide forces for combat incident to operations on land, and that of the Navy to provide forces for combat incident to operations at sea. Any proposal to cure this nonexisting defect, by removing the existing restraints on Pentagon tampering with the roles and missions prescribed by the Congress, will bring on a constitutional crisis.

There are ample indications that the Pentagon's fiscal officials have been able to exercise a degree of control of military operations and functions, supervening their fiscal judgment over those responsible and accountable for such matters. This practice has grown to the extent that the Pentagon's arbitrary management of the funds appropriated by the Congress in some cases amounts to a direct challenge to the constitutional function of the Congress to determine what is to be accomplished by the use of public moneys. It has come to the point that the adding machine in the Pentagon has become more lethal than the sword and more powerful than the Constitution and the Congress. As an illustration, the Senate will recall that, under a previous Democratic administration, the Congress voted funds for a 70-group Air Force, but the executive branch impounded all funds except those needed to maintain a 48-group Air Force; under this administration, $40 million above the budget request was allowed by the Congress to keep the Marine Corps at its statutory strength, but this money was impounded as well and the will of the Congress was flouted; and most recently $32 million was allowed by the Congress for the building of National Guard installations in the various States, and of that amount $22 million has been frozen by the Bureau of the Budget. This bill clarifies the functions and powers of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense.

The proponents of radical reorganizations of the Defense Department have been acting on the premise that our organization for exercising military leadership in the strategic planning of NATO, of SEATO, in fact of the whole Free World has been a failure—incapable of dealing with our own internal military affairs, and hence not to be trusted in the larger considerations of worldwide military strategy. They would have us believe that our military posture is that of a defeated nation whose armed forces have been defeated and destroyed. Acting on that premise, they would have us discard what has been in fact a remarkably capable and successful defense structure—one that has been more than adequate to every emergency.

I believe that it is a serious mistake to give to the world this untrue picture of the United States military organization. Only fundamental defects could justify radical changes in our organization. There is no reasonable basis for believing that the organization which has been uniformly successful has suddenly become fatally defective.

In summary, the bill will result in a restoration of sound administrative procedures, and will effect a reduction in the bureaucratic overhead that today only serves to impair strategic planning and to hinder the accomplishments of the military services.

It is my firm conviction that the bill is constructive without being disruptive. It will result in greater efficiency, economy, and most importantly, in a greater security for our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement outlining the principal features of the bill, and also a series of three speeches I made earlier this year on the Pentagon and the Defense Establishment.

There being no objection, the statement and speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The principal features of this bill are as follows:

1. Eliminate 14 of the present 25 Deputy or Assistant Secretaries now in the Department of Defense. This will clear out the great mass of persons of high station in the Pentagon hierarchy who have no positive authority—they produce only negative authority—the ability to say "no"—thus they can only serve to impede, hinder, and delay. This change will assure faster, better decisions, a documented necessity today. The heavy burden borne by the Secretary of Defense will be lightened through the elimination of many direct subordinates who engage in make-work and force minuscule decisions to reach him, assisting the Secretary of Defense in his difficult job. Reducing the over 2,400 employees in the Department of Defense to a maximum of 600 will be of equally great importance in reducing the burden of minutiae presently carried by the Secretary of Defense.

The crushing burden this reduction in Pentagon hierarchy will lift from the military departments cannot be measured except that it is certainly of great magnitude. That the military services will be able to give greater attention to the job of improving our national security is certain.

2. Include the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the National Security Council, bringing them into the planning of our national strategy. Presently the military department Secretaries sit only occasionally with the National Security Council. Making certain that the National Security Council decisions will be made only after consideration of positive information on our

military and naval strength will materially improve our national strategic planning.

3. Restrict the activities of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense to that properly within his authority. The changes proposed would require the Comptroller to limit his activities to fiscal policy and procedures and deny him authority to control strategic decisions and operational activity of our military forces.

4. Recognizes the requirement that the Secretary of Defense must have personal assistants to aid him in matters of his office pertaining to public affairs, legislation and legal (General Counsel). These personal assistants are not intended to interfere with or duplicate the duties performed, and necessarily so, by the military departments in these areas.

5. Strengthen the Joint Chiefs of Staff by providing them authority over our worldwide deployed forces—unified commands, the geographical regions of responsibility, and the all-important coordination of and between such commands.

6. Specifically authorize the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to delegate many details of the direction of the respective services to their principal assistants without reducing their responsibility as the uniformed heads of their services. Thus preserving the proven essential of any successful system of military direction—unity of planning with responsibility for execution of such plans.

7. Limit assignment to the Joint Staff to 3-year increments, materially strengthening our military services as well as increasing the efficiency of the Joint Staff. Valuable experience will be spread throughout our military and naval forces, while at the same time the Joint Staff will be supplied with officers who have intimate practical knowledge and experience of these forces. The creation of a self-perpetuating, select group of planners, isolated in the Pentagon and insulated from the facts of military reality, is prevented.

---

### Executive Determination and Roles and Missions

There is an alarming indication that increasing attention in the Pentagon is being directed toward removing basic roles and missions of the armed services from existing statute and making them subject only to executive determination.

Such a move is being advocated under the guise of strengthening the Secretary of Defense and streamlining the Defense Department. This may strengthen the executive agency. But it will weaken legislative authority and status in an area in which Congress has wisely and resolutely insisted on the exercise of its prerogative and responsibility since the founding of our country.

What are these roles and missions? Briefly, these constitute the specific provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, amended, which set forth the fundamental and basic roles and missions of each of the armed services. In a sense these provisions of law constitute a charter for each armed service, a kind of directive from Congress stating the purpose for which Congress, in accordance with its constitutional responsibility, creates, provides for, and maintains each of the armed services.

It must be clearly understood that the statutory prescription of roles and missions is not a detailed statement of the specific day-to-day jobs, weapons, techniques, research projects, and routine activities. Rather, roles and missions in law are stated in broad, flexible, and elastic terms which do not make this statutory assignment of roles and missions a straitjacket, a restriction, or an impediment to scientific and technological progress.

I doubt if anyone today could prescribe in more fundamental and more flexible terms the roles and missions of the armed services as they were written into the National Security Act of 1947 with its subsequent amendment.

It must be clearly understood that the roles and missions of the National Security Act are separate and distinct from the detailed assignment of functions of the armed services. The functions of the armed services are the details of the jobs and duties of the armed services, stated in more specific terms than exist in law. Essentially, the functions, which are prescribed by the executive authority of the President or the Secretary of Defense, are adjustable from time to time to new techniques, new weapons, new scientific discoveries. Such functions are amplifications of the basic roles and missions prescribed by law.

So, in the combination of the wording of the roles and missions in the National Security Act as written by Congress and the detailed, adjustable assignment of specific functions by the executive, there is a completely proper, workable, and successful device by which the legislative and the executive can exercise appropriate authority with respect to what the armed services are to do.

This matter of statutory prescriptions of roles and missions is no new issue. In fact, it was probably the fundamental issue connected with the National Security Act of 1947. It certainly received more attention from Congress in its consideration of that bill than any other feature of that law.

I would like to briefly review some of the pertinent facts in connection with the inclusion of roles and missions in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended.

As originally proposed, the National Security Act of 1947 did not include the statutory outline of roles and missions. Rather, it was proposed that an executive order on roles and missions would be issued upon passage of the security act. However, Congress, in its wisdom, decided that it was not only the right of Congress to prescribe basic roles and missions for the armed services but it was an inescapable responsibility of Congress to so do. Such an attitude on the part of Congress was not readily accepted by the executive sponsors of the proposed national security act. Congress was resolute in its position and set forth in properly worded provisions the fundamental roles and missions of each of the armed services.

I would like to point out that Congress, alert to the practical realities of defense matters, recognized that two elements of the armed services were in jeopardy. Because they considered those elements to be necessary to the attainment of a properly balanced defense organization and because such jeopardy should not be permitted to continue, Congress was more precise in the prescription of roles and missions for naval aviation and the Marine Corps.

Congress reaffirmed in even more emphatic terms, through Public Law 416, 82d Congress, 2d session, its insistence upon a continued maintenance of a combat ready Marine Corps as a national force in readiness. Congress underlined its attitude and determination in this respect by stating that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should have coequal status with other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in consideration of all matters pertaining to the Marine Corps and that, among other provisions, the Marine Corps should be maintained at a strength of 3 combat divisions and 3 air wings.

It was perfectly obvious at that time that powerful factions within the armed services bitterly opposed this Congressional decision.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind but what the Marine Corps will be destroyed as a combat force in readiness if present efforts to remove roles and missions from the law are successful. There is no place for the Marine Corps as it has developed, as Congress wants it, and as the country needs it, in the master plan of those who wish to centralize all military authority under somebody in the Pentagon.

It is just as certain that our balanced naval power, with its unsurpassed naval aviation, as well as its Marine landing forces, will be destroyed if the roles and missions are removed from statute. We will find the United States, which is in fact an island Nation dependent upon maritime power for economic and military survival, possessing a navy which no longer will contain the unique American attribute of sea power—the balanced fleet.

This effort—and it is a persistent one—to remove roles and missions from law is not only a matter of military importance. It is of basic constitutional importance which is impossible to overemphasize in matters of legislative-executive relationship. In a practical sense the statutory prescription of roles and missions is one of the few meaningful instruments by which Congress can discharge its proper responsibility with respect to defense policy. If roles and missions for the armed services, as now prescribed by law, are removed from existing statute and made subject to executive whim, little will remain for Congress to do except appropriate moneys for the Pentagon.

This effort, which is gaining momentum within the Pentagon today, is one of the most fundamental issues of our times. Congress could not, and I predict will not, look lightly or casually upon attempts to divest Congress of its authority and its responsibility to prescribe these basic roles and missions. Those persons who have, since 1947, refused to accept the decision of Congress to include roles and missions in the National Security Act must not be permitted to succeed with their efforts to undo this Congressional decision.

There has not, in recent years, been a more clearcut manifestation of a Congressional mandate in defense policies than the Congressional determination to prescribe roles and missions rather than leave it to the executive.

I don't believe that Congress will permit this Pentagon power play to succeed. I do not believe that Congress and the American people will ever permit the Pentagon to erase the statutory safeguards that assure a continued existence of the Marines as an ever-ready combat force.

---

### The Armed Services and Parkinson's Law—II

There has been much talk about the debilitating effects of inter-service rivalries. I would point out that while service rivalries have caused friction and waste, that rivalry in this sense should not be confused with service competition. Service competition has done much to uphold the morale of the services, and it has undoubtedly saved the country lives and dollars. There is a need for continued healthy service competition, but the lines should be drawn sharply so that honest, worthwhile endeavors to excel will not be compounded by efforts to eradicate and to place one service paramount to the others.

I think there is much to be said in behalf of the continuation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff because, as a result of this, we have the best judgment of the combined thinking of the best men in all the services. If the Joint Chiefs of Staff concept was to be done away with, it would mean that the alternative would be the creation of a single chief of staff or principal military adviser to the President who would, on the basis of his single judgment as against the collective judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the present time, be empowered to make decisions in behalf of the security of this country. This kind of substitution—this one-man judgment—should be avoided as much

as possible. I think that, far better than breaking up the present system we have at this time, it would be in the interests of the Nation and our security to bring about a reorganization within the Pentagon itself.

Parkinson's Law—the multiple additions to a civilian bureaucracy—is a classic illustration of what is happening in the Pentagon. It is my understanding that there are in excess of 30 assistant secretaries or their equivalent in the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force. These assistant secretaries have their assistants, and in addition to these there are numerous commissions and committees. Many of these civilians in the Pentagon can and do give directives to the military personnel stationed there, and they do so while the responsibility rests not with them but with the officers to whom they issue orders. The question of the coupling of authority with responsibility in the Pentagon is one which the Armed Services Committees of the Congress ought to investigate and make recommendations to correct. There are too many political appointees in the Pentagon who know too little about matters military. There are too many of these appointees who stay for too short a while, learn too little, and who accomplish little except to add to the disorder already prevalent throughout that building. Too many of these temporary civilian administrators try to formulate policy, in all fields of defense and very likely too many of them, all too often, interfere when they should be minding their own business.

In my opinion, it would be a good thing if the Armed Services Committees would look into the question of the chain of command and find out, for example, just how many steps there are between the individual joint chiefs of staff and the President of the United States or, for that matter, the Secretary of Defense. We find, for example, that in the New York Times of February 6, 1958, an article by Hanson W. Baldwin states that General Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff last September, said, "There are 19 civilian officials between the Army Chief of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief who either command, control or influence his [the Chief of Staff's] conduct of the business of the Army."

The civilian bureaucracy which has grown up in the Department of Defense should be overhauled. It is not a small policy-forming group superimposed on the separate services as was originally contemplated. It now numbers thousands of employees who do not confine themselves to policy, but who duplicate and confuse the work done by the individual services and who delve deeply into administration, operations and even command. It is time to streamline the Defense Department. It is time to take a look-see at this swollen civilian bureaucracy, and it is time to reduce the number of assistant secretaries and assistants to the assistant secretaries. It is time to find out what the numerous commissions and committees have been doing, and if they have been doing nothing, it is time to abolish them. It is time for a housecleaning not to the end that the Pentagon must be made an example of, but to the end that greater efficiency, better organization and greater stability in the Department of Defense can be established. It is time to do away with the political appointee and to put in his place the dedicated public servant. It is time to recognize that the Defense Establishment in its proper sphere can and does make a contribution to our democracy. It is time to restore greater respect among and between the services, and it is time to give to our military leaders, under sound civilian administration, the functions which are supposedly theirs under the laws of the land.

THE ARMED SERVICES AND THEIR NEEDS—III

Mr. President, President Eisenhower has sent to Congress a record-breaking peacetime budget. The largest portion of the administration's program for fiscal year 1959 is for an expanded and accelerated defense effort. World events have spurred the United States on to new achievements in weapons, missiles, and rocket technology; a prerequisite to the maintenance of our position as a world power.

Vast sums of money have been spent and much more will be expended in years to come for an ever-improving arsenal of weapons and equipment for the Armed Forces. As the tools of modern defense become more intricate and complex the need for more highly skilled technicians and operators becomes more important. Contrary to some beliefs, the human element in defense is now in a position of great importance than at any other time in our past history.

The emphasis has now shifted from a preoccupation with numbers of men to that of the quality of our men in uniform.

Greater numbers of men will not meet the challenege. Only marked increases in the level of competence and experience of the men in the Armed Forces can provide for the effective, economical operation required by the changing times and national needs.

Although numerical strength objectives are being met, the Armed Forces are not able at the present time and under the present circumstances, to attract and retain the kinds of people needed for the period of time necessary for them to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force. The problem in the simplest terms is, How do we stop the rapid turnover of military personnel?

Recommendations were submitted last year to the Secretary of Defense by Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation which would, if put into effect, acquire and retain the competent personnel required by our defense activities. The recommendations of this committee, more frequently called the Cordiner Report, have been put into legislative form in a bill introduced in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

In presenting their recommendations, the committee expressed its belief based on exhaustive studies that "through modern management of the manpower in the armed services, we can simultaneously reduce the cost and increase the effectiveness of the national defense. The committee feels that through the adoption of their program in its entirety it will be possible to attract, retain, and motivate the scientific, professional, technical, combat leadership and management skills required by the Department of Defense today and in the future. It is believed the improvements will be far reaching and long lasting, and will bring in greater savings and gains with each passing year as the new systems are instituted. Such benefits cannot be achieved by half measures which adopt the terminology but kill the substance of the recommendations."

I am in accord with these recommendations and, in my opinion, we will be derelict in our responsibilities if positive action is not taken during this session of Congress.

In approaching this problem of military personnel we should consider two things: What is the situation today and what can be done about it?

At the present time there are approximately 2.5 million men in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

Since 1939 the annual costs of the Armed Forces have increased approximately 3,500 percent.

According to information I have received from the three services during fiscal year 1956 there was a turnover of 1,472,512 military personnel. These figures are based upon gross gains, including reenlistments, and losses. During this same year the estimated additional cost of the turnover of personnel in the Army alone was $1,104,000,000 and it is estimated that it will cost nearly as much in the current fiscal year.

The cost of our defense apparatus is of such magnitude today that it is unfortunate that billions must be lost each year to the turnover of personnel because of resignations, retirements, the reduced rate of reenlistments, and then the induction and training of new officers and enlisted men. Not only is this a needless expense, it is lowering the proficiency and capabilities of our military people when the contrary is so vital in this age of advanced technology.

One of the most disturbing things about this rapid turnover is that first term reenlistment rates are highest among personnel for whom the training investment is lowest; conversely, reenlistment rates are lowest where the training investment is highest. This is one of the major findings of the Cordiner report.

Every time the Air Force loses a B–52 aircraft commander the Federal Government loses $809,360 in prerequisite training and flying costs and this same amount must be invested in a new B–52 commander.

In 1950 the training of a multiengine airplane pilot was approximately $34,470. With the more advanced equipment, the training of a B–52 aircraft commander costs $401,950. This represents the upgrade training only. And, additionally, prerequisite flying costs for each of these officers is in the area of $407,410, a total of $809,360. Similarly, I am informed that in 1950 the training of a single-engine jet pilot cost $38,000. In 1957 the training of an F–102 pilot has climbed to $233,930.

In 1950 the training of a communications officer cost the Air Force approximately $8,600, while in 1956, to train an officer to be a qualified communications-electronics staff officer, the cost has been established as $27,470. In 1957, the Air Force lost 15,400 officers. This represents a loss to the United States of billions of dollars.

The major contributing factors causing this increase are the vastly increased complexity of the equipment used and the advances in technology. This training and equipment is so expensive we cannot afford to waste it.

In the Army the training of a pilot in 1950 cost $7,000 and today it costs $24,000 to train a fixed wing airplane pilot. In 1950 it cost $3,716 to train a microwave radio repairman; today this same training costs $5,076.

While it is easy enough to retain the less skilled in whom the taxpayers have invested little training money, the electronics maintenance men and operators, the radarmen and the missilemen, the aircraft mechanics, the pilots and navigators—these men with the key skills of modern defense are leaving the Armed Forces as fast as they can.

When they go, they not only take with them thousands of dollars worth of training acquired at the taxpayer's expense, but they leave the Armed Forces with the frustrating task of starting all over again with raw recruits.

Some turnover is inevitable and desirable. But the turnover rates that exist in the critical skills and among the young officers is dangerously and destructively high.

During his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. Cordiner stated that during the course of his committee's study, they found out that 73 percent of the junior officers completing obligatory tours of duty during fiscal year 1955 promptly returned to civilian life. In fiscal 1955, 4,000 pilots left the Armed Forces. This represented a minimum training loss alone of $480 million and a severe loss to the country's capacity to respond immediately and powerfully to an enemy attack.

An important consideration in this high turnover is that it takes 500,000 trainees just to maintain an effective combat force and support service of 2.3 million. The more of those 2.3 million trained people we can induce to reenlist and develop toward even higher skills and responsibilities, the fewer trainees we will need to maintain an effective force.

The challenge before us is to build up the reenlistment rates of the men who have the skills that are most needed, or who have the aptitude to develop such skills. These people cannot be retained without offering genuine incentives.

How can we best meet the challenge? I am firmly convinced that this can be done by adopting the recommendations of the Cordiner report.

The Cordiner report proposes a modernized compensation plan. Skills, performance and incentive would be a major consideration in adjusting the military pay scale rather than length of service alone.

The Department of Defense would be given greater flexibility and control over the distribution of skills and experience in the services and the emphasis would be placed on quality rather than quantity.

The adoption of the committee's recommendations would mean a 15 percent improvement in the combat capabilities of the Armed Forces, without a significant change in the budget. After 1962 there would be savings in defense costs of over $5 billion. Training accidents would be sharply reduced. It would allow a reduction in the number of military personnel for national defense. And above all, the adoption of these recommendations would improve the attraction, retention, and motivation of the officers and airmen in the armed services.

In addition I feel that there is a great need for additional fringe benefits such as low-cost insurance, dental care for dependents, commissary and PX privileges and other inducements which are an attractive consideration to our military personnel, particularly family men.

When we talk about increased pay, increased benefits we automatically think about increased costs. In the area of defense one might feel that the costs would be staggering but, as a matter of fact, the implementation of the Cordiner report would mean savings after the first couple of years.

The astounding thing about the proposals recommended in the Cordiner report is that it would require only about $600 million a year in increased payroll costs even when the armed services have a top strength of 2.8 million.

The savings from increased retention would very quickly offset these added payroll costs, and the second full year of operation would result in net savings that would increase year after year. Statistics presented to the Armed Services Committee indicate that gains would overtake the costs in fiscal 1960 and that by 1962 the gains would rise to $367 million.

If the entire program is put into effective operation, the Department of Defense has estimated that $5 billion savings can be achieved by fiscal 1962.

Since the beginning of World War II we have depended upon the draft as a permanent source of men for the armed services. Much of the military manpower is either drafted or influenced by the draft. I cannot help but feel that the the selective service program is not an entirely satisfactory means of maintaining an adequate force under present conditions. Conscription should be used only when other means and inducements are not meeting the quotas.

A man who is inducted into the service by the draft is there, usually, for only as long as he has to be and does not reenlist. And I don't know that we can blame these draftees because no one is as efficient and aggressive doing something they do not like. Many talents are wasted under the present system. What we want and need are career military personnel. The draft will never satisfy this need.

We want to make a career in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force so attractive that most of its members will be there because they want to be. I am convinced that a military career can be made that attractive. The recommendations of the Cordiner report recognizes the need and presents a reasonable solution. I firmly believe that the implementation of new incentives and an adjusted compensation schedule will make the abolition of the draft desirable.

I believe also that now is the time to raise the I. Q.'s of the enlistees and inductees in the armed services. At the present time the Army requires a score of 40 for all enlistees and a score of only 10 for inductees on the Armed Forces Qualification Test. The minimum score of 10 is based upon Congressional action. All branches of the armed services base their intelligence ratings on the Armed Forces Qualification Test. Each service is required to take 12 percent of their enlistees from those people who score in category IV; that is, those who have a test score of less than 30. I understand that a category IV test score is equivalent to a score of approximately 70 on an I. Q. test. The average I. Q. for the entire Nation is 85 to 114.

According to information I have received from the Office of Education the following table illustrates how the population of the United States stands on an intelligent quotient basis:

I. Q. of 150 or above, near genius: 0.1 percent of the population is found in this category.

I. Q. of 130–149, very superior: 3 percent of population in this category.

I. Q. of 115–129, superior: 14 percent in this category.

I. Q. of 85–114, normal, 66 percent in this category.

I. Q. of 70–84, dull, 14 percent in this category.

I. Q. of 60–69, borderline: 2 percent in this category.

I. Q. of 59 and below, moron, imbecile, idiot: 1 percent in this category.

This last category can be broken down still further as follows: 40–59, moron; 20–39, imbecile; 0–19, idiot.

These criteria are adapted from the Stanford-Binet tests. Although the I. Q. average or median for the entire population varies somewhat, it is approximately 100.

The complexities of our modern weapons and instruments require a much higher quality of personnel than ever before. The simple fact of the matter is that the Army, under existing physical and mental standards, has been required to take too many men with low mentalities to perform the highly complex and extremely important assignments that have been imposed on the Army. The other services are not forced to take in inductees so they have been able to establish somewhat higher standards. I think it is time that the intelligence requirements for the Armed Forces be raised to a more realistic standard.

In fiscal year 1957 of 179,000 individuals inducted, approximately 63,300 were mental group IV—the lowest I. Q. group. Twenty-six thousand seven hundred of these failed to meet current minimum aptitude requirements for training. Nonproductive expenditures occasioned by their discharge will exceed $69 million. These cost figures do not include intolerable waste in training time and material.

Mr. President, the House passed in the last session legislation, H. R. 8850, which is now pending before the Senate Armed Services Committee giving the President somewhat broader authority, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, to defer from training and service in the Armed Forces persons whose induction would tend to produce an excess of persons with similar qualifications in certain categories. The President would have the power to modify these standards.

This legislation would improve the present situation, and I hope that the Senate Committee on Armed Services will consider this legislation at an early date. When we are attempting to improve the caliber of our Armed Forces, we should give them an opportunity to select men on somewhat higher standards than those that now prevail.

Mr. President, national survival is the most vital issue confronting us in the nuclear age. We, therefore, must have a highly skilled and efficient Armed Force. This is vital to the interests of the taxpayers and the entire Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there were a number of recommendations made in those speeches which I think are significant in an understanding of the difficulties which confront us in the study of the Defense Department and our security. They are:

First. The power of Congress to prescribe roles and missions for the Armed Forces must remain with the Congress, and not be transferred to the Executive.

Second. The collective judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is a superior mechanism than would be the creation of a single chief of staff or principal military adviser to the President.

Third. The number of assistant secretaries, their assistants, commissions, and committees in the Pentagon should be reduced drastically and the civilian bureaucracy in the Department of Defense should be overhauled.

Fourth. The Cordiner report, or something approximating it, should be adopted.

Fifth. The minimum I. Q.'s of all enlistees and inductees should be raised to a more realistic standard.

Sixth. If the Cordiner report, or something similar to it, is adopted, the draft should be abolished.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am very glad to join with the majority whip, the able and distinguished junior Senator from Montana, in introducing legislation designed to effect a much needed reorganization of the Department of Defense.

As previously pointed out, this bill is identical to H. R. 11001, known as the Vinson-Arends-Kilday bill.

My decision to join in introducing this bill was prompted by my observations and study of defense organization in the course of my service as a member of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, and as a Commissioner of the Hoover Commission.

It is evident to me that the mushrooming bureaucracy at the top levels of the Pentagon has gone far beyond that which was contemplated when the Department of Defense was created. This stifling bureaucracy, combined with persistent efforts in some quarters to undermine our Joint Chiefs of Staff, poses potentially grave dangers to the security of our Nation and the continuation of our form of Government.

I completely concur with the distinguished majority whip that Congress

must act to restore efficiency, commonsense, and economy to our defense organization.

The proposed legislation will accomplish such a necessary objective. It does this, in part, by drastic, but imperative, reductions in the number of under secretaries and assistant secretaries. The elimination of about half of the Pentagon's secretarial hierarchy will have a healthful effect.

Actually, it is not difficult to identify the reason for the development of this huge administrative complex which we find in the Pentagon. Each additional grant of power to the Office of the Secretary of Defense has been accompanied by bureaucratic growth. Contrary to proven business practice which accommodates to growth by decentralization, the Pentagon has erroneously sought efficiency through constantly increasing centralization and an increase of personnel. This fixation on centralization of power and functions has become an administrative quicksand.

The real examples of wasteful duplication can be found in the manner in which the bureaucracy in the Office of the Secretary of Defense duplicates the work of the military departments. The bill will begin to remedy this situation by eliminating 1,800 of the 2,400 civilian functionaries in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The remaining 600 may well prove to be an excessive total. If so, it can be further reduced by subsequent legislation. Proportionate cuts can be made in assigned military personnel.

I wish to emphasize that the proposed legislation will not in any way impair the authority of the Secretary of Defense. He now has direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense. That is all the power he could possibly use. Any further grant of power would be giving power for the sake of power—a disastrous policy for a government such as ours.

Of course, the key to efficient administration of our vast Defense Establishment is the provision, very deliberately written into the law by Congress, that the military departments "shall be separately administered by their respective Secretaries under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense."

This provision of law has been largely circumvented. Thus, in the interests of national security, financial economy, and orderly administrative processes it must be rigidly observed and obeyed in the future. It is the principal safeguard against unrestrained bureaucracy and administrative collapse in the Pentagon.

The proposed legislation would also strengthen the already successful Joint Chiefs of Staff system. Under its provisions the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be given greater statutory authority and responsibility over the unified commands. Also, it grants authority for the chiefs of services to delegate routine administrative matters to their principal assistants, thus providing the service chiefs, if they feel they need it, more time for strategic planning. This, very significantly, is a permissive, not a mandatory, provision. It in no way effects a legal or physical impairment of the unity of service command and Joint Chiefs of Staff membership. This unity is the indispensable feature of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It combines authority and responsibility. It provides realism. It prevents the fatal isolation of the ivory tower.

I would like to emphasize that the bill does not increase the authority or status of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Any further enhancement of that office will bring his position dangerously close to that of at least a de facto single chief of staff. Such a development might well lead to military disaster, if reliance is placed on the military judgment of one individual and that judgment proves erroneous.

Mr. President, this continual drive for concentration of power in the Pentagon is not only militarily dangerous, but it is creating one of the great constitutional issues of our times. Further centralization of power in one man will inevitably challenge the constitutional authority and responsibility of Congress with respect to the appropriation of funds for specific military purposes and the Congressional determination of basic roles and missions of the armed services. No direct challenge or indirect usurpation of the Congressional prerogatives in these vital matters can be tolerated.

In summary, the proposed legislation will return organizational sanity to the Pentagon. It will result in savings in manpower and money.

It will strengthen the Joint Chiefs of Staff and simplify and improve the formulation of military policy. It will retain the kind of healthy competition between the armed services such as put Explorer and Vanguard in orbit, but provide the means for preventing wasteful duplication.

It does not endanger our national survial by increasing the powers of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman or the functions of the Joint Staff, which would set the stage for a fullfledged Prussian-type supreme high command.

The bill is responsive to our military requirements and it will go far toward preserving proper legislative-executive relationships in defense matters. It will help to make our Nation militarily strong without making it militaristic.

I am very happy to join with the distinguished majority whip in the introduction of the bill. I hope it will be the focal point—the center—of future reorganizations of the Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3544) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], my senior colleague [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize an additional $500 million for urban renewal projects under title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3548) to authorize additional funds for urban renewal projects under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that there should be immediate action to authorize at least $500 million in new funds for the Urban Renewal Administration, approximately doubling the size and scope of the program previously proposed to the Congress for the next fiscal year and there should also be provision for any additional staff needed to speed up construction on projects already in progress and in processing new applications for the 35 States and 4 Territories participating in the program.

This proposal should stimulate and accelerate construction in key city areas throughout the United States during this period of economic downturn. It should also have a very real impact on bolstering our urban communities, confidence in the Federal Government's firm intent not only to continue but to substantially expand its economic participation in useful works now open to it like the urban renewal program. These projects are not make-work projects, they come within the definition of the President's recommendation.

To date more than $1,145,600,000 out of the total fund authorization of the Urban Renewal Administration of $1,250,000,000 has been reserved for approved projects.

Applications are currently coming in at the rate of $50 million a month and the Urban Renewal Administration estimates that by the end of this fiscal year some 3 months away, it will have nearly $300 million worth of applications on hand above and beyond the limits of its existing lending authority. Therefore, I believe the proposed legislation deserves the same prompt consideration Congress already has accorded another key antirecession measure, the bill to stimulate home building so speedily passed last week.

This urban renewal proposal being introduced today is a vital legislative supplement, we believe, to the directive President Eisenhower sent the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Albert Cole, on March 19 instructing him to assign top priority to accelerating the start of construction on urban-renewal sites already cleared and to speed the disposal of project land ready for construction almost immediately following sale. Our bill also provides for staff expansion which should virtually eliminate the regrettable time lag in processing urban renewal applications which in some cases has discouraged community par-

ticipation completely or led to the cancellation of projects stalled by delay in the planning stages.

The proposed legislation specifically provides that under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the limitation on the Urban Renewal Administration's lending authority now standing at $1,250,000,000 shall be increased by $500 million effective on the date the bill is signed into law. It authorizes the agency to "make such action as may be necessary to expedite the processing of applications of local public agencies for assistance—and for that purpose such additional personnel may be employed, in accordance with the civil-service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as may be required to carry out the accelerated program contemplated by this act."

Measures already introduced on urban renewal for fiscal year 1959 would authorize $250 million in additional lending authority for the administration so that the actual construction work can begin on some 120 projects in fiscal 1959, compared to 56 in 1957. Even that figure falls short of meeting the already existing and long-range urban renewal needs, particularly in the area of residential construction for middle-income families.

The inadequate scope of our present program was dramatized just recently when the American Municipal Association reported the results of its urban renewal survey among more than 140 communities which already have or want such projects. These localities estimated that under the present formula where project financing is assisted by Federal grants approximating two-thirds of net project costs, they would require $513 million in grant reservations for the calendar year 1958. For the entire period from 1958 through 1967, they could undertake urban-renewal construction calling for more than $3 billion in Federal assistance. And it must be noted that this figure still does not reflect the full amount that could be expended since 10 major cities of over 100,000 population already active in urban renewal did not return estimates.

An analysis made by the Urban Renewal Administration shows that as of February 1958, there were 46 survey and planning applications pending from cities totaling $188 million. Fourteen of these projects, involving a total request of $58 million are located in cities where the recession has taken hold and they have been declared areas of "substantial labor surplus". Even with the additional $50 million which will become available on April 1, the Urban Renewal Administration under present circumstances will not be able to even process some of these documented applications from labor surplus areas until the beginning of the next fiscal year in July.

The urban renewal program now so widely accepted serves a double-barreled purpose: by providing a sum large enough to prompt communities to initiate new projects and to push forward those already in progress, we will supply a vitally needed impetus to construction in certain economically distressed areas, while simultaneously encouraging communities to draw up and expand a long-range program of urban development which will ultimately improve living conditions for millions of Americans.

This type of public project is not a "make work" project. On the contrary, such projects come directly within the definition of the President's recommendation that the projects adopted should be projects already in process, for which the planning has been done, for which there is orderly administration, and which can go at once when we "fire the gun." That is the reason for our support of this legislation.

My colleagues, who are joining me in the introduction of the bill and I believe, that it is one of the most effective and constructive antirecession moves which could be made. It fits in with the job we are doing. It is favored in all parts of the country. Its practicality assures it success. I urge that this proposal be given high priority attention.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. I commend the Senator from New York for the proposal which he has presented. I should like to ask a question.

Is it not true that many of the municipalities which might otherwise have applied have not done so because they felt that the funds available have been exhausted, or would have been exhausted shortly?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly so. In the city of New York there are a great number of projects ready to go, which are not going because the money is not available. Our purpose is to make the money available, so that the button can be pressed on those projects.

Mr. PURTELL. Would not the proposed legislation spread the amount of money available, so that it could be used in many other communities which at present are unable to avail themselves of the benefits of the program?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. PURTELL. Also, the bill would stimulate employment.

Mr. JAVITS. It would stimulate employment, especially in the building construction industry and the durable goods industries, which need stimulation so badly.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HRUSKA) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3414, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3414, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO CORRECT UNINTENDED BENEFITS AND HARDSHIPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO TAKE POSSESSION OF NAVAL OIL SHALE RESERVES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 21, 1958,

The names of Senators BENNETT and BARRETT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3539) to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, on March 21, 1958.

## REFERENCE OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that there is lying on the table Senate Joint Resolution 159, introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself, on March 4, to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship. It has been lying on the table since that day.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over measures of this kind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, is is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at Oakland, Calif., on March 21, 1958.

Statement by him issued at Sacramento, Calif., March 21, 1958.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Excerpts from remarks by him upon accepting the DAR award of merit, at the annual luncheon of the Philadelphia chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, in Philadelphia, Pa., on February 5, 1958.

## NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS, PROMOTIONS, AND DESIGNATIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. GREEN. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that the Senate has today received a list of 127 sundry nominations for appointment to and promotion or designation in the Foreign Service.

Notice is hereby given that the list will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

---

## LAW DAY, U. S. A.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the America we know and love will endure only so long as she remembers the everlasting truth embodied in William Pitt's pithy phrase "Where law ends, tyranny begins." For this reason, the American Bar Association renders America a service of profound significance when it calls the attention of the public to President Eisenhower's proclamation setting apart May 1, 1958, as Law Day, U. S. A., and urges the bench, the bar, and the people of America to pause on that day and appraise at its real value our most precious heritage—the law—which may be fittingly described in John Galsworthy's words as "a majestic edifice, sheltering all of us."

At the recent southern regional meeting of the American Bar Association in Atlanta, Charles S. Rhyne, the president of that fine organization, and one of our greatest contemporary legal statesmen, delivered an eloquent and penetrating address in which he emphasized the importance of Law Day, U. S. A., as a time to "rededicate ourselves to our most solemn responsibility, the responsibility of preserving and passing on to the generations which will follow us as citizens of the United States of America the heritage of individual human freedom and equal justice under law which has been ours, and which rightfully must be theirs." Mr. President, this eloquent and penetrating address merits the consideration of all Congressmen. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DAY, U. S. A.

"The law: It has honored us; may we honor it."

It seems most appropriate that we who began the bar association year in London come here to Atlanta to observe the halfway mark in this year of great effort and great dramatic events for the organized bar. London and Atlanta: history fairly drips from the atmosphere of each. In each an era is "gone with the wind." In each the glorious past was and is but a prelude to an even greater future. Each today is certainly bursting with its participation in the events of the New World which dramatic intellectual and technological accomplishments have created.

Today, amidst such historical surroundings, I wish in effect to launch an effort of the organized bar which I sincerely believe will be the greatest event of all time in the history of the law. With our minds so much attuned to the historical background of law since our London meeting, it seems fitting that this great day for the law—of which I am now to speak—receive its first impetus here in Atlanta, a city famous the world over for its historical contribution to the development of law and for its great lawyers of the past and of the present.

The great event I refer to is Law Day, U. S. A., which President Eisenhower has proclaimed as May 1, 1958. This official proclamation is a call for action in recognition of the law and what it has meant to our country, and imposes a duty and responsibility upon lawyers to apprise the people of America of the great privilege it is to live under the rule of law. We must do our part on Law Day, U. S. A., to bring home to our people the tremendously important role of the law in our daily lives as well as the increasingly important role that law must play in relations between nations.

Because of our daily contacts with our Nation's legal structure and our ceaseless battle to insure equal justice to all of its inhabitants, we lawyers are perhaps a little more appreciative of our life under the rule of law than the average man. But lawyers and laymen alike should pause and recognize the tremendous contribution which law has made to our way of life, both as a promoter of our progress and as an insurer of the rights which made that progress possible.

The selection of May 1 as Law Day, U. S. A., has great significance. May 1 is also the day on which international communism celebrates its past victories and looks forward to its future conquests. There could be no better date for us to recall the basic moral and philosophical principles upon which our society is based, and to contrast them with the cynical, immoral, and atheistic philosophy which underlies the international Communist conspiracy.

In the context of current history we are going through an inventorying process as we gird ourselves to fight the Communist menace, which operates by economic, psychological, and subversive means as well as by threat of armed force. It seems well that we tie to our strengths and shore up our weaknesses. In any such inventory one must concede that the idea of individual freedom under law is the great ideal we offer to the world. Respect for and adherence to law is ingrained in all Americans. So it has been since the birth of our Nation. While the average individual is not learned in the law, there is an intense sense of justice which burns within him. There is an almost instantaneous adverse reaction to any unlawful or illegal action. We believe in, and we live under, the law. We are a "lawful" people.

It seems well, therefore, that we pause to pay tribute to the law and what it has meant to us. The space age has brought a need for new concepts, as new frontiers and new horizons have been opened to the human race. But there is also a need to reaffirm old traditional concepts whose validity and fundamental importance cannot be shaken by any scientific or technological achievement. The rule of law is such an unshakable concept.

Among all the contending ideas which have fought for the minds of men since the dawn of history, the concept of individual human freedom has been outstanding. On this concept, which embodies the natural law, which was the heart and core of Magna Carta, which is the spirit and guiding light of our Bill of Rights, we can build with every confidence that it is a foundation not of sand but of everlasting rock.

Individual freedom and justice, under law, is the great principle that distinguishes our form of government and our way of life from the Communist system. It is the keystone of our moral leadership in the world. This unique national observance of Law Day, U. S. A., affords a dramatic opportunity for the American people to reaffirm their dedication to the rule of law and to demonstrate to the world that their faith in it is unshakable.

As our Declaration of Independence affirms, the true purpose of government is the protection of the fundamental rights of man. Any denial of this purpose necessarily results in absolutism. Dean Roscoe Pound has said that the strongest bulwark of any nation against absolutism is the law. But, as totalitarianism has illustrated, this bulwark is real only when the concept of the law includes also the concept of natural rights. It is by the denial of this basic principle that totalitarianism is able within the framework of so-called law to subvert the primary purpose of the law. Basically, the true advantage of the rule of law in a democracy is the affirmation of the dignity and individuality of the human being. It is the affirmation of the purpose of the state to protect and safeguard this dignity. It is the recognition that the state exists for man, and not man for the state. Only within such a philosophy can a government of law and not of men be assured. Without such a philosophy, government by rule of law becomes impossible, and arbitrary rule must necessarily be substituted for it.

From its inception to the present zenith of its power, ours has been a "government of law rather than of men." Colonial and frontier courts applied as law that innate wisdom of the centuries which had come down to them through the crystallized public opinion of what is fair as recorded by Aristotle and Montesquieu and Coke. And while our whole system of law was bottomed firmly upon the great principles and precedents of the English common law, we also created law of our own fitted to the needs of the New World. A good example of this is the famous jury charge of Judge Andrew Jackson, who presided over thousands of trials in the frontier country of western North Carolina and the new State of Tennessee. He instructed juries to "Do what is right between these parties. That is what the law always means."

Law is the intangible force that makes freedom and progress possible. It is law that brings order into the affairs of man—that enables them to lift their sights above mere survival, to accumulate possessions, to develop the arts, to pursue knowledge, and to enjoy life among their fellows. Law gives the individual security that he could obtain in no other way; it protects the family and other groups organized for the advancement of common interests; it permits the growth of great cities and the development of vast enterprises. In other words, it is the cement that holds our free society together.

And what is law?

Definitions by great men down through history have been many:

Samuel Johnson called the law "the last result of human wisdom acting upon human experience for the benefit of the public."

Cicero said: "Law is the highest reason, implanted in nature, which prescribes those things which ought to be done and forbids the contrary."

Grotius said: "Law is a rule of moral action obliging to do that which is right."

Blackstone's definition of law is probably the one most quoted in law schools. He said: "Law is a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong."

Charles Evans Hughes said:

"The fundamental conception which we especially cherish as our heritage is the right to law itself, not as the edict of arbitrary power but as the law of a free people springing from custom, responsive to their sense of justice, modified and enlarged by their full will to meet conscious needs and re-

strained by authority which is itself subject to law—the law of the land."

We tend to regard too narrowly, and too shallowly, the law and its functions and purposes. When we regard the law as a servant of our free-enterprise system, we see the truth, but only part of the truth. When we see the law as the great resolver of differences, when we see the law as the one viable substitute for brute force in human society, when we see the law as the guardian of our rights and the protector of our freedoms, we see clearly, but always in part only. The law is all these things, and more.

Law is in a sense codified history; but not merely this. It is also medicine, accounting, engineering, and science—for all professions in the ultimate depend upon law as the basic foundation for their existence and operation and service. They are licensed and governed by law.

Law is made up of the accumulated wisdom of the people, plus the power to pass decisive judgment in accordance with that wisdom, plus the various procedures, formulas and facilities involved in legal process. But the power to pass decisive judgment is not law in and of itself, any more than legal forms and formulas and all the panoply of process, taken alone, are law. Nor is the accumulated wisdom of the people law without the power to pass decisive judgment and all the machinery necessary for handling particular cases. But when these three—wisdom, power, and machinery—are combined, when the power of government is used to apply the accumulated wisdom of the people to individual cases through a system of legal machinery which is available to every individual, then we have a true rule of law.

One of our most priceless blessings as citizens of the United States of America is our rich heritage of ordered freedom under law.

Our Nation was created and nourished on due process of law. The liberties found in our Bill of Rights are the essence of America.

Law reigns supreme in our Nation at the municipal level, the State level, and the national level, and is the one common thread which runs through the wide variety of mechanisms used by local, State, and Federal governments to achieve governmental objectives. From the adoption of the Constitution down to the present day, law has been the cement which has held together our complicated local, State and Federal governmental structure. Supremacy of the law is the concept which has controlled at all levels of government. In every instance the aim is to put law above the whims of man. We as a people believe in and have lived by William Pitt's famous saying, "Where law ends, tyranny begins."

Civil law aims at orderly and peaceful adjustment of all reasonable claims. Criminal law aims at protection of the public, punishment of the offender, and deterrence of commission or repetition of the offense.

Law is concomitant with good government.

We need to make the distinction between a government under law and a government under laws. This is important. You cannot have a government without laws, for even the spoken whim of an absolute monarch is a law for his subjects. Government under law means much more than just having laws. Government under law connotes stability, permanence, almost timelessness. Government under law connotes rightness, righteousness—in the sense of conformity with the natural law—and justice. Law connotes order and certainty.

In a government under law, it is recognized that basic individual rights are only formulated by laws, but do not depend for their existence upon such laws. In a government under law, there is no arbitrary power to punish any man except for a distinct breach of the law established in an ordinary legal manner before the courts. And in a government under law, every man is equal before the bar of justice, without any distinction based on class, whether of race, or creed, or wealth, or color, or any other.

Equal protection of the law is a cornerstone of our governmental system: equal justice under law to the poor and to rich, to the weak and powerful alike.

Law is rooted in justice. Justice is both its foundation and its objective.

We speak of our ideal as a government of law and not of men; but we cannot have a system of functioning law without men. It takes men—wise men, and trained men—to preserve the accumulated wisdom of the people, to understand it, and to apply it to particular cases. It takes men—dedicated men, selfless men—to exercise properly the power of decisive judgment. It takes men—skilled men, diligent men—to operate smoothly the machinery which we call legal process. All these are among the functions of lawyers. Here is the justification for the legal profession. The greatness of our Nation is due to the liberty under law that exists here—a liberty which lawyers have created and fought to maintain all through our history. We lawyers can be proud that our profession has lived up to its duties and responsibilities.

Government under law is impossible without lawyers. Every new invention or scientific discovery, every new business practice, every new activity in which the Government itself engages, poses new problems which lawyers must solve. In both form and content, almost all the institutions of government are the work of lawyers. But lawyers are seldom fully appreciated, and the extent of our national need for lawyers is neither felt nor recognized except in times of great stress or emergency, when the services of lawyers become priceless and indispensable.

Time was when development of the law by a slow evolutionary process was sufficient to keep it abreast of normal political, scientific, and industrial transformation. But today, if the evolution of the law is too slow to keep pace with racing scientific and military technology of our space age, we shall almost surely face disaster. The hope of civilization is establishment of the rule of law on an international basis to govern relations between nations, not only on the planet earth but in outer space as well, before some unwise application of force sends the four horsemen of war, pestilence, famine, and death on what may be their last ride across the face of the earth. The struggle for a world ruled by law must go on with increased intensity. We must prove that the genius of man in the field of science and technology has not so far outstripped his inventiveness in the sphere of human relations as to make catastrophe inevitable. If man can conquer space he can also solve the need for legal machinery to insure universal use of space for peaceful purposes only. With the Kremlin now only 30 minutes via missile from Washington, the absolute necessity of such machinery requires no further emphasis.

Self-government by law is an inherent right of free people.

The Pilgrims who came to Plymouth Rock and our first permanent settlers at Jamestown sought escape from the arbitrary power of an English king who ruled without the law's restraining influence. These ancestors of modern-day Americans carried in their minds a dream of reestablishing the individual liberty under law which King John had promised more than 300 years previous when he affixed his seal to Magna Carta at Runnymede.

Today, after 350 years, the greatest strength of America lies in this concept of individual liberty under law. Other systems of government have produced great scientists, great musicians, and other outstanding achievements. But no system has produced the individual freedom which exists in America. And the reason for this achievement is that our system is founded upon and governed by the rule of law.

The more one reads and studies history the more he becomes impressed with the amazing wisdom of the draftsmen of our Constitution. One explanation for their wisdom may be that they were more experienced than we in the abuses of governmental power. They lived in times of monarchy, feudalism, military dictatorship, colonialism, revolution, and, yes, even anarchy. They were able to create our Constitution which provides all the powers necessary to govern and yet leaves the basic reservoir of power in the hands of the governed. Our Government is one of checks and balances. The three branches of Government, and the checks which each of these branches has on the others, constitute our best insurance that the absolute power necessary to form a tyranny will never vest in any one branch.

Our Constitution—the greatest statement of the basic wisdom of the centuries ever put together for the government of man—was not created out of thin air. Its draftsmen drew upon the great lawgivers of all centuries. They used those principles which the test of experience had proven. That is why it has endured and met the new and novel needs of each new generation.

Supremacy of the law, which transferred sovereignty from ruler to the ruled, has guaranteed our individual freedom. Law Day, U. S. A., must underscore and emphasize in the mind of every American this concept of legal supremacy—not the supremacy of law over ruler, alone, but the supremacy of law over force in a world which through space conquest has become too dangerous to live in without law replacing weapons as the ultimate decision mechanism to resolve disputes between nations.

There are only two alternatives to law, and they are: On the one hand, terror—on the other, chaos. In a society without rules there would be no freedoms, no property rights, no protection for the weak, no basis for commerce or business or industry. Under a tyranny which knew as rules only the current whims of the tyrant, black terror would stalk and lurk, thrive and grow. The only possible counter to force would be force, and freedom and justice would have no place. The foundation and matrix of our free society, the protection of our individual security, the basis for our accumulation of personal possessions, our development of our talents, our pursuit of knowledge, and our right to enjoy life, are the law.

We tend to take too much for granted the great principles which underlie our system of government. We have a legal system which, in spite of the size of our country and the necessary complexities of its organization, assures for the average citizen more vigorous protection for life and person, more widespread justice, more equality under law, more effective protection for individual rights, more evenly distributed economic opportunity, more security in person and property, and greater personal freedom, than any other system yet developed in all the history of mankind. What more meaningful proof is there that life under the rule of law assures the best existence yet devised by man?

In this era when dictators have supplanted law with force in captive nation after captive nation, preservation of the ideals of individual human rights and equal justice under law will require much of us who now enjoy it. We shall have to love liberty as passionately, cling to our ideas as stubbornly, respect law as deeply, and place our faith in divine guidance just as firmly as did our

inspired pioneer forefathers who founded a nation in freedom.

It is upon leadership that our future depends. And leadership of the mind is all important in this area of dramatic change and progress. Leadership in instilling in our own people such an appreciation of what life under the rule of law means that they will help us lawyers in selling the rule of law to the peoples of the whole world as mankind's best hope for survival in the space age. Our offer of leadership to the world must be more than bigger and better weapons or missiles—we must tell the people of the whole world that we who glorify the rule of law at home will step out on the path of progress and lead toward a lawful and peaceful existence for the world community, and for the unknown and unexplored frontiers of space as well.

Let us pledge each other, here and now, to rededicate ourselves to our most solemn responsibility, the responsibility of preserving and passing on to the generations which will follow us as citizens of the United States of America the heritage of individual human freedom and equal justice under law which has been ours, and which rightfully must be theirs. And let us pledge ourselves to meet the challenge to the rule of law which our shrunken world and the space age encompass. Such a rededication and such a pledge must be the meaning to the legal profession of Law Day, United States of America.

Let us be ever aware that the seat of the law is a throne of purest justice and her crowning glory is a wreath of truth. In the words of Daniel Webster: "The law: It has honored us, may we honor it."

## TRIBUTE TO WORKMEN OF ELECTRIC POWER COMPANIES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, during the recent snowstorm I was one of those without electricity for more than a day. This is not the first time I have had this experience. The last time I had it was in Maine, in the 1954 hurricane.

It should make us stop and think about the many things in life that we take for granted and of which we seem to be lacking in appreciation. It is the old story of not appreciating something until one does not have it.

With these thoughts in mind, I commend the Washington Post for one of its editorials appearing in today's issue. The editorial appropriately pays tribute to the personnel of the electric power companies who worked around the clock to repair the damage and restore the service.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELL DONE

Congratulations are in order for the linemen and crews of the Potomac Electric Power Co., the Virginia Electric & Power Co., and the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., who worked around the clock to repair the extensive damage from last week's storm. All three companies recognized the storm as a major emergency. With many thousands of lines down and hundreds of thousands of homes without light, heat and, in many instances, water, the pressure for quick repairs was great, and the companies responded accordingly. Some linemen worked for 24 hours or longer without stopping. Additional crews were brought in from as far away as North Carolina.

Throughout the emergency the inconveniences and hardships were eased by the knowledge that workmen were exerting extraordinary efforts to restore service at the earliest possible moment. When the power came on again, public appreciation was expressed in some instances by what amounted almost to neighborhood celebrations of the event. We surmise that everyone who melted snow for water, dug wood from under the snow for heat, resorted to candles for light, and subsided in frustration when the telephone went dead will echo a vote of thanks to the indefatigable workmen who shortened the ordeal.

## EXTENSION OF THE EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am sure all of us recognize that the Washington Star is one of the most outstanding and responsible newspapers in the entire country.

In yesterday's Star there appeared an excellent editorial entitled "Humbug and the Capitol," and a news story on the Capitol extension as approved by the Congress and the special Commission, entitled "East Front Architects Blast Foes as Unethical."

A second news story appears in today's Star entitled "Architects Differ Widely on East Front Extension."

I trust that every Member of this body will read the editorial and the news items. Senators will find the intelligent and straightforward approach of the Star quite in contrast with treatment of this subject from time to time by some newspapers and magazines.

Mr. President, there are always two sides to a question. Not long ago I asked the Senate not to be hasty in condemning the Vice President, the Speaker, and the minority leaders in each branch of the Congress for giving their approval to a plan to duplicate exactly the east front of the central section of the Capitol in enduring marble.

Mr. President, the editorial and the articles which have appeared in the Washington Star of yesterday and today fortify my belief that as Senators become aware of the actual facts, they will be convinced that the approved plans should be carried into effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Humbug and the Capitol," and the news article entitled "East Front Architects Blast Foes as Unethical," published in the Washington Star of yesterday, and the article entitled "Architects Differ Widely on East Front Extension" published in the Washington Star of today, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 23, 1958]

HUMBUG AND THE CAPITOL

The popular campaign against carrying out the 94-year-old proposal to extend the east front of the Capitol reflects a noble sentiment.

That sentiment is directed against "vandalism," "barbarous mutilation," "destruction of our heritage," "elimination of the Capitol plaza," "messing up the Nation's superb and unique Capitol," "vandalism and extravagance" and intent to "hack up and deface the historic United States Capitol."

Nobody wants to see such things done. Yet that is the prospect, if the stories Americans are reading in many of their newspapers are true. But are they true?

We think they are untrue. We think they present an extravagant and irresponsible distortion of the facts. The record should be set straight. We plan to set it straight in a series of articles beginning on the first page of today's Star. For the public hysteria whipped up by an organized campaign—notable for its grotesque misrepresentations—is far more dangerous to intelligent preservation of the United States Capitol than anything attributed to the proponents of the east front extension.

Thomas U. Walter, who designed the Capitol dome and the Senate and House wings, was the first Architect of the Capitol to propose an east front extension, in 1864. Every succeeding Architect of the Capitol has favored it. Were they vandals? The National Commission of Fine Arts has favored it in principle twice—under leadership of such champions for the preservation of things worth while as Gilmore D. Clarke and Charles Moore. The roster of other extension proponents includes the designers of the National Gallery of Art, the Lincoln Memorial, the Folger Library and most of Washington's other buildings of classical beauty. These men, as well as present consultants, are among distinguished architects who have favored extension of the east front. Are they guilty of favoring mutilation of the Capitol?

Is Speaker of the House RAYBURN moved, as has been charged, by a whimsical desire to exploit his influence and deface his Capitol? Are those who sit with him on the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol in favor of hacking it up?

In the series of articles beginning today we propose to examine some of these and other vicious suggestions used to color criticism of the extension. We also believe it is important to consider the alternatives to extension of the east front—just as they have been considered at such length over the years by those best qualified to judge the feasibility of what might be done, in circumstances requiring that something must be done.

We have no quarrel with those who disagree with "scheme B." Tastes, architecturally and otherwise, of course differ. Somebody has to decide, and a decision was made. But it is unfortunate that a realistic problem, demanding intelligent solution, has been so widely misrepresented by so many people who know nothing about it, and that those who do know something about it have been subjected to such ignorant abuse.

[From the Washington Star of March 23, 1958]

EAST FRONT ARCHITECTS BLAST FOES AS UNETHICAL—CONSULTANTS SEE MISREPRESENTATION DRIVE TO BLOCK CAPITOL EXTENSION

(By George Beveridge)

Architect consultants working on the east front extension of the Capitol accused the American Institute of Architects last week of unethical conduct and misrepresentation in its campaign of opposition to the Capitol project.

The accusations, it was learned, were made in two angrily worded telegrams to AIA President Leon Chatelain, Jr., and AIA Executive Director Edmund R. Purves, both of Washington.

One of the wires said the AIA has conducted a rabble-rousing campaign to appeal to the emotions of 11,000 (AIA) members of whom many have not seen the Capitol, and of whom few know any of the facts surrounding it.

It urged that the AIA stop immediately the use of AIA publications to call upon the membership to exhort the Congress against the extension until members have more facts on which to base a decision.

The signers of the telegrams—all AIA members—have been working for 2 years as advisers on the extension project and related Capitol improvements. Specifically, their wires protested that the AIA has—

1. Lent its weight to repeating "false and unsubstantiated statements * * * made by people who are not familiar with the problems in regard to the alterations to the Capitol * * *."

2. Failed to recognize the studies which have been made in "a highly professional and dedicated manner by competent architects and engineers, the majority of whom are either fellows, honorary members, or members in good standing of the AIA."

3. Failed in its service to members by not presenting "any fact concerning the physical condition of the building and the nature of the dome overhead, so that the membership would have been in position to pass intelligent judgment."

4. Followed a highly unethical course by failing to properly represent all members of our profession rather than to take sides on a project about which it has heard only the statements, many of them untrue, circulated by the opponents. * * *

Architectural advisers signing the wire to Mr. Chatelain were John Harbeson, of Philadelphia, Gilmore D. Clarke, of New York, Roscoe DeWitt, of Dallas, Alfred Easton Poor, of New York, Jesse M. Shelton, of Atlanta, Fred L. Hardison, of Dallas, and Albert Homer Swanke, of New York.

The second wire, sent to Mr. Purves, was signed by Mr. DeWitt alone.

Mr. Harbeson, whose Washington works include design of the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Federal Reserve Board Building on Constitution Avenue and the Pan American Union Administration Building, was 1 of 3 prominent architects named 2 years ago to a top-level consulting panel on the extension. The other two members were Henry R. Shepley, of Boston, and Arthur Brown, Jr., of San Francisco. Mr. Brown died last year. Since that time, Mr. Clarke, a landscape architect and honorary member of the AIA who for many years was Chairman of the Federal Fine Arts Commission here, has been added to the panel.

ADVISERS' RESENTMENT MOUNTS

Mr. Shepley, a noted Boston architect associated with projects throughout the world, did not sign the telegrams. He is, however, still a member of the extension advisory panel.

Other architects who signed the telegram are members of a second panel of associate architects working on details of the controversial east-front extension. All the architectural firms of these men either are currently involved in other Capitol Hill expansion projects, or have been at some time in the past.

The telegrams brought into the open a steadily growing resentment by the architectural advisers against what they consider an improper representation of the architectural profession's position on the Capitol extension.

The charge of rabble rousing in Mr. DeWitt's telegram referred to the AIA's recent distribution of Memo, a regular newsletter of the organization. The March 10 issue, sent to all AIA members, was devoted mainly to sharply worded newspaper accounts of opposition to the extension, and included this paragraph:

"Despite success to date, a long, hard battle lies ahead to persuade the Congress to rescind previous actions and appropriations. Those desiring to prevent the east front extension should telegraph or write their Senators and Congressmen immediately."

CHATELAIN DEFENDS STAND

In a reply wire to the consultants, Mr. Chatelain defended AIA actions as carrying out the "convention mandate" voiced in resolutions of opposition to the east front extension during the last few years. He added:

"This involves, as we see it, keeping the membership informed as to the status of legislation relating to the east front, the Congressional committee involved, the individuals to whom they should express their views and general public reaction to the proposals. We have taken the necessary steps in the current controversy as we have on other instances on which the institute has an expressed policy.

"In quoting editorial comments of many leading newspapers, we were informing the membership about what apparently is the prevailing public opinion on the matter." Mr. Chatelain also said he had difficulties finding the alleged "inaccuracies" and said he would welcome specific examples.

WOULD REPRODUCE FACADE

In a response to Mr. Chatelain's wire, Mr. Horbeson has written a letter to the AIA Journal entitled "The Institute Is Unfair to Architects." It contends that the AIA has violated its own written code of ethics by failing to adequately inform itself on the Capitol controversy, and by "demeaning" the professional reputations of the consulting architects.

The east-front controversy involves a move to build an addition which would project the old central portion of the Capitol's east front, between the House and Senate wings, 32½ feet eastward. The present sandstone facade of the existing front would be reproduced precisely, in marble, including the columned portico and the walls, with all their historic ornamentation.

Briefly, this is the project status: Three years ago, Congress set up a five-man House-Senate commission and, in a legislative appropriation act authorized it to spend such money as needed to carry out the extension. The legislative language said the extension should be in substantial accord with scheme B of an east front extension study which was made in 1904. Scheme B called for a 32½-foot extension. During the last 3 years, plans have been completed for the extension, at an estimated cost of $10.1 million, and $17 million actually has been appropriated for this and related purposes. The commission is now ready to let contracts for construction. Pending in the Senate, however, is a bill—supported by a large number of Senators—which would hold up the project until further studies are made.

PLAN CALLED VANDALISM

Supporters of the Senate bill, including spokesmen for the AIA, contend there are no reasons valid enough to justify the extension. They call it vandalism, the needless destruction of perhaps the Nation's most beloved structure. This contention has roused expressions of opposition throughout the Nation, from architects, historic and preservation societies, newspaper editorials, and individuals.

It is against the form and substance of this that the consulting architects at work on the extension project last week directed their protests to the AIA.

In a series of articles, of which this is the first, the Star will examine the various issues of the controversy, the charges of opponents and the arguments which the extension proponents say have been distorted, misrepresented, and bypassed. Subsequent articles will deal with the nature of the architects' opposition, the present condition of the east front, what might be done if the east front is not extended, the architectural defect of the east front, and the controversy over Capitol space.

[From the Washington Star of March 24, 1958]

ARCHITECTS DIFFER WIDELY ON EAST FRONT EXTENSION—VIEWS RANGE FROM VANDALISM OF SHRINE TO IMPROVEMENT OF HISTORIC VALUES

(By George Beveridge)

Setting the record straight on how architects feel about extending the east front of the Capitol is like piecing together a jigsaw puzzle.

To many architects, the proposal authorized by Congress to extend the east front 32½ feet forward between the House and Senate wings is senseless destruction, a vandalism of the Nation's most historic shrine. To others, it is an improvement which is essential to preserve, not destroy, the east front's historic values. This conflict has existed—among architects—since the extension was first proposed nearly a century ago.

It exists today.

PLANNERS VOICE PROTEST

It caused a group of prominent architects who are planning the extension to voice a bitter protest last week against their professional organization, the American Institute of Architects, which is leading an intensive, well-organized campaign of opposition.

The protesting architects contend the AIA is pursuing a pattern of organization opposition without adequate knowledge of the facts involved. This, they say, is misleading AIA members and the public.

They contend that charges of vandalism and desecration against the Capitol, endorsed by the AIA, are a personal affront to their professional integrity as architects.

And they condemn the implication that most knowledgeable architects—present and past—oppose the extension.

ARCHITECTS SUPPORTING PLAN

What architects have supported it? Here are a few who have spoken out over the years, and some of their work:

John Russell Pope, architect of the National Gallery of Art, the Jefferson Memorial, the Archives Building and Constitution Hall; Egerton Swartwout, the Missouri State Capitol; Henry Bacon, the Lincoln Memorial; Clarence Zantzinger, Department of Justice Building; Robert Mills, the Washington Monument; Charles A. Platt, the Freer Art Gallery; John F. Harbeson, the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Federal Reserve Board Building; Francis P. Sullivan, who remodeled the Capitol's House and Senate Chambers.

Advocates of the east front extension site these proponents because they represent unmatched knowledge in classical architecture—of which the Capitol is a prime example—and because their work developed some of the great buildings of the Nation.

PART ENDORSEMENT CITED

Roscoe DeWitt, of Dallas, one of the consulting architects now at work on the extension, notes that these architects favored the century-old extension proposal in order to improve the Capitol's architecture, not detract from it. He adds:

"Can any architect who has opposed the extension show greater work than these magnificent monuments of architecture? Would it not be wise for the layman to accept the counsel of the great, rather than that of those who have yet to prove their greatness?"

The record shows that the Fine Arts Commission—the traditional watchdog of Washington's architecture—twice has endorsed the extension, in 1919 and in 1935.

FIRST PROPOSAL IN 1864

Mr. Swartwout, a former Vice Chairman of the Commission, testified in the Senate in 1937 that he had always been much interested in this extension, and "I talked about it

a great deal with the members of the Fine Arts Commission." He added:

"I know pretty well how they feel, the architects in general that have had experience with this work. I think I have never found any of them who did not think this was a good thing, and I think it is myself absolutely necessary to the completion of the Capitol."

The east front extension first was proposed by Architect of the Capitol Thomas U. Walter in 1864, to complete the effect intended when, under Mr. Walter's direction, the House and Senate wings were built and the present dome was built. Since then, the extension has been urged by every architect of the Capitol and every consulting architect who studied and reported on it to Congress.

During the last 3 years, resolutions opposing the extension have been passed at AIA conventions.

SENTIMENT NOT UNANIMOUS

But even at the top level of the organization, the sentiment has not been unanimous, and on some occasions a different viewpoint has not been allowed to be expressed to convention delegates.

On June 12, 1956, for example, Edmund R. Purves, AIA executive director, appeared before a Senate appropriations subcommittee on behalf of the AIA to oppose an appropriation for the extension, which Congress subsequently granted.

Under questioning, however, Mr. Purves admitted that a report of a special AIA Committee on the National Capitol—favoring the extension—was disapproved by the AIA board of directors at the 1955 convention in Minneapolis and never reached the convention floor for a vote.

And in the same questioning 2 years ago, Mr. Purves—who just last week issued a bitter blast against the extension project—admitted that he personally favored the extension.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX TESTIMONY QUOTED

Following is a part of the 1956 Senate testimony:

Senator HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona: "Why was the (special committee) report ignored?"

Mr. Purves: "The report was not ignored. It was considered at considerable length. But the members of our board of directors, after listening to the report of the committee and other members who appeared before them at that time, and after a discussion of the question, arrived at the conclusion that the board opposed the extension. It was rather obvious, I think, Mr. Chairman, that there was disagreement."

Senator HAYDEN: "The committee appointed by the National Association of Architects, known as the National Capitol Committee, made a recommendation approving the action that was proposed to be taken here. The national organization, I assume, that is not as familiar with the facts as the local committee that was here to look into it, or that was delegated especially to do that, decided not to follow their judgment. That is all there is to it."

Mr. Purves: "That is it."

FAVORED ORIGINAL PROPOSAL

Senator Clements, Democrat, of Kentucky, then pressed Mr. Purves for his personal sentiments, and asked whether he favored the AIA committee report. The exchange went this way:

Mr. Purves: "In answer to your question, if I must answer it, Senator, I must say 'Yes.'"

Senator Clements: "You were in sympathy with the original recommendation to extend it?"

Mr. Purves: "Yes, sir; I can say that."

Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican of Massachusetts: "Then, as to these national fellows from all over the country who don't know Washington particularly, you just don't agree with them?"

Mr. Purves: "Well——"

Senator SALTONSTALL: "I never knew architects to agree on anything, so it is perfectly all right to talk."

Mr. Purves: "I wish this were off the record."

Mr. DeWitt, in a statement he has drawn up to explain the position of the architect-consultants on the east front extension, says the opposition has been expressed solely on sentimental grounds and pressed within the AIA over the years by a small, dedicated group.

Among its leaders are Lorimer Rich, of New York, whose work includes the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and who helped kill the east front extension move during Congressional hearings in the thirties. Others include Ralph Walker, of New York, who recently was awarded an architect of the century medal by the AIA, and Julian Berla, of Washington, who heads a newly formed Committee to Preserve the Nation's Capitol.

WINS WIDE SUPPORT

During the last few months, Mr. Berla's committee has generated nationwide support from individuals and historic, preservation, and patriotic societies.

The opponents contend they have had no real opportunity to see the extension plans while they were being drawn, and that Congress authorized the extension in 1955 with virtually no public hearings. There is truth to both charges.

J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, says only the special House-Senate commission directing the extension has had the power to release plans, and commission activities have been tightly controlled by its chairman, House Speaker RAYBURN.

The suspicion is that Mr. RAYBURN realized a full-scale set of public hearings probably would ensnarl the extension proposal in deadlocked controversy, as has happened for 50 years. The fact, however, is that Congress freely approved the extension legislation 3 years ago, and has voted appropriations for it on 2 occasions since.

AIA OPINION QUESTIONED

If hearings have been scarce during this round of Congressional activity, however, advocates of the extension say there likewise has been scanty discussion at AIA conventions.

Mr. DeWitt's statement, for example, says that "a mere handful of members was present and but a very few of that handful voted" when the extension issue was raised at a recent national convention he attended.

"To represent that action as truly representative of the feeling of American architects is to misrepresent the facts," he said. "The true fact is that the average thoughtful, competent architect, knowing none of the factors which are involved, would refuse to express himself. Certainly well over 10,000 of them did not vote and did not write letters to their Congressmen or Senators to stay the move."

LEGISLATIVE MANDATE CITED

"Those who did vote and those who did write letters were concerned wholly with the matter of sentiment. Had these same men known the true nature of this defect in (the east front's) design, could they have been apprised of the condition of the building, could they have known that its days are numbered unless remedial steps are taken, few of them would have raised their voices or taken their pens in hand."

AIA officials have and other opponents in no instance directly attacked the professional ability of any of the private architects who have been retained by a Congressional commission to plan and supervise the extension.

The opponents, however, have contended that the consultants' hands have been tied by the language of the extension act passed by Congress. And this is one basis on which they have asked Congress to hold up the project.

The language they refer to says that the east front extension should be in substanial accord with "Scheme B" of a study made in 1904, which proposed an extension of 32½ feet. No matter how opposed the consultants might be to this provision, the opponents say, they have no choice but to try to work with this mandate.

CONSULTANTS' REPORT RECALLED

Charging that the consultants are opposed to this plan, the opponents cite a report issued last year by the three top-level consultants—Mr. Harbeson, Henry Shepley of Boston, and Gilmore D. Clarke, landscape architect and former Fine Arts Commission Chairman. The report urged in strong terms that eventually the House and Senate wings—as well as the central portion of the east front—be moved forward 32½ feet, and said the consultants felt that only in this way could the "present beauty of the Capitol be kept."

The fact, however, is that the only project now authorized is to extend the central portion of the front, between the wings. And that has not tempered the support of the consultants.

Mr. Harbeson, in a letter to the AIA last week, has protested that the AIA has told its members that the architect-consultants' "opinions should not be trusted" by suggesting that "no architect of note or responsibility has approved the extension of the east front."

MEMBERS SEEN DEMEANED

"It has thus demeaned its own members working on this project at the present time, who have recommended the work," Mr. Harbeson wrote.

In hearings last month before the Senate Public Works Committee, Mr. Harbeson urged the east-front extension and said specifically that "We have not been hampered by the wording of the act." In the same hearing Alfred Easton Poor, of New York, coordinator of the group of architect and engineer consultants working on the project, said:

"It is our considered opinion that we have not at all been handicapped by the wording of the act. * * * Had we felt that we were so hampered we would have reported the fact to Mr. Stewart (Architect of the Capitol J. George Stewart, who hired them)."

PLANS NOW COMPLETE

Plans for the east-front extension are complete and, unless Congress acts otherwise within the next few weeks, contracts which already have been prepared are expected to be signed to start the new construction.

In back of all the pro-and-con furor over the project are three specific controversies. The controversies, which also are the reasons the extension is being pressed, are: (1) The present deteriorated condition of the Capitol, (2) a complex series of architectural fights over how the Capitol should look, and (3) a need for more Capitol space.

Subsequent articles of this series will attempt to clear up some of the confusion that has been generated about each of them.

## EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a tragic and emergency situation has developed at the Portland Veterans' Administration hospital and other veterans' hospitals across our country.

The Veterans' Administration requested $6 million in the way of additional funds for inpatient care for the fiscal year 1958, and these funds were approved in the second supplemental appropria-

tion which is now in conference, after being passed by both the House and Senate. There was no disagreement as to funds for inpatient care for the Veterans' Administration. Congress has, indeed, taken prompt action when the facts were brought to its attention, and I know that no Member of Congress would favor the closing of hospital wards and the laying off of trained professional and nonprofessional medical personnel.

Notwithstanding the second supplemental appropriation which will be approved shortly by the Congress, the Veterans' Administration will find itself short several million dollars for fiscal year 1958 for inpatient care. I have been advised that the Veterans' Administration has initiated a request for this money, which is now being considered by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter dated March 18, 1958, from Dr. William S. Middleton, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. Dr. Middleton's letter explains the 2-percent reduction that will take place at the Portland and other Veterans' Administration hospitals for the fourth quarter, fiscal 1958.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
*March 18, 1958.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The pending action concerning the Portland, Oreg., Veterans' Administration Hospital, about which you inquired today, involved all Veterans' Administration hospitals. The reduction for the Portland hospital will be $20,096.

On March 6, 1958, stations were alerted that their 4th quarter fund allotments were to be reduced by 2 percent from the amount initially set up when the fiscal year began. On March 14, 1958, confirmation of the reduction was made. This was considered necessary because we will be unable to realize the financial resources contemplated by the fiscal year 1958 Appropriations Act.

The Appropriation Act, Public Law 85-69 of June 29, 1957, provided $708,656,000 for inpatient care, of which $6,656,000 was to be realized from reimbursable services. For such services there has been a substantial decrease in collections so far this year due to a United States district court decision limiting the Government's ability to collect on insurance policies assigned to the Veterans' Administration by some of its patients. It is now estimated that, at the most, $3,500,000 will be collected before the close of the fiscal year. Under the circumstances the described reduction in 4th quarter fund allotments is required to avoid deficiency operations.

I hope ways can be found to minimize the impact of this reduction before the close of the fiscal year.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM S. MIDDLETON, M. D.,
*Chief Medical Director.*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, unless the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress take prompt action, skilled medical and other personnel will be laid off at VA hospitals, and hospital wards will be closed. This urgent situation was brought to my attention by Mr. Charles H. Huggins, Department of Oregon commander, the American Legion, and Dr. Penn C. Crum, chairman of the department rehabilitation commission. I ask unanimous consent that their telegram be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 17, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator, Oregon,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Dr. Spendlove, manager, veterans' hospital, Portland, received a TWX from Chief Medical Director's office that there would be a withdrawal of 2 percent of his funds for inpatient care April 1. This would possibly close one ward, lay off personnel, and increase waiting list. Any delay in this cut in funds that you can effect will be greatly appreciated.

CHARLES H. HUGGINS,
*Commander, the American Legion.*
PENN C. CRUM,
*Chairman, Rehabilitation Commission, the American Legion.*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Portland Veterans' Hospital, along with other VA hospitals, has a long waiting list, and it would be tragic if hospital wards are forced to be closed. Equally tragic is the fact that loyal professional personnel will be laid off. The able manager of the Portland Veterans' Hospital, Dr. J. Gordon Spendlove, has no alternative with the reduction of his funds for the operation of the hospital. Reduction-in-force notices already have been given to quite a few Portland Veterans' Administration employees, and both professional and nonprofessional personnel are affected.

It is my hope that the Bureau of the Budget will take prompt action so that the request by the Veterans' Administration for an additional several million for inpatient care can be promptly submitted to Congress. I know that Congress will vote the needed funds, and the burden now rests with the Bureau of the Budget, an agency in the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks two letters I have just received from residents of Portland telling of the situation at the Portland Veterans' Administration Hospital, together with an item entitled "More VA Bed Losses?" from the March 19 issue of the National Legislative Bulletin of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the letters and item were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 18, 1958.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Yesterday, reduction-in-force notices were given to quite a few Portland Veterans' Administration hospital employees. Both professional and nonprofessional personnel were affected.

We were told that this was necessary because of the withdrawing of funds from the station in connection with budget problems within the Veterans' Administration. We were also informed that if the emergency appropriation measure now before Congress is passed that the RIF notices will be canceled.

I urge you to do everything within your power to get speedy and fair action on the VA appropriation measure; however, I hope that you will go further and inquire as to why funds for the medical care of hospitalized veterans is continuously being threatened.

This area is already faced with a critical unemployment problem and the VA hospital cannot maintain adequate care for the hospitalized veterans if their budget is reduced.

Respectfully yours,
WILBUR M. WATTERS.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 18, 1958.*

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am greatly interested in the bill supporting the VA deficiency funds for impatient care. I favor it for several reasons, in which I believe you at least partially concur. There is already considerable unemployment all over the country, and Oregon has already been hard hit all winter, so that more unemployment by Uncle Sam himself seems hard to understand. Secondly, the VA has already had several cutbacks in recent years, and with rising costs everywhere there is an automatic cutback in services to veterans without cutting present operating expenses. Civil service at present pays less than other similar jobs outside, so with lower pay plus less security plus lower morale how can you get and keep good employees? The other point is that a hospital for veterans is not being operated and maintained for budget purposes, which is cold, calculating and impersonal, but to give hospitalized veterans the best care, with reasonable expense. Are veterans to be turned down when really sick because the budget won't allow it?

I hope you will urge it being brought out of committee and voted upon as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. LOUISE H. WELDLICH.

---

[From the National Legislative Bulletin of March 19, 1958]

MORE VA BED LOSSES?

At this time the 1959 budget for the VA is in the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices. It went there with a Bureau of the Budget recommendation for a cut of 1,000 VA hospital beds. Supplemental funds for the remainder of this year are also necessary and if a Senate-House conference fails to come up with additional funds it will mean closing down 310 beds during the next 3 months. For in-patient care there would be a shortage of $3¼ million and, according to United Press reporting, VA Administrator Whittier told the House Appropriations Subcommittee that such shortage would mean closing five VA hospitals. VA is reported to be planning reductions in hospitals, in wards, and in beds in a total of at least 10 VA hospitals beginning April 1.

As hospital doors are closed and beds shut down, where do the sick and broke veterans go? Unless they are to be ignored entirely, the responsibility will fall to the communities and the States. Do the latter have the facilities to take care of the additional needs? The answer is "No."

## SHORTCOMINGS OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the latest storm has many lessons for us if we choose to learn from the damage it has caused and the emergencies it has created.

Communities and whole areas have been deprived of heat, light, cooking, and refrigeration facilities owing to power failures. Great hardship and some deaths have resulted from the storm's

damage. Secondary roads have been blocked and some people left in cold, darkness, and want. Towns have been isolated, and telephone wires are knocked out; hospitals and homes for the aged and indigent were without heat and light for hour after hour, making proper medical care an impossibility. Many private homes were similarly affected, including homes with sick children. The whole situation added up to a major civilian emergency, and the most severely hit areas were those bordering on the Nation's Capital.

The harsh fact, Mr. President, is that we are horribly unprepared to cope with anything like a real emergency on the civilian front. If a spring snowstorm can wreak such havoc, Senators can imagine the devastation of an enemy missile attack.

Obviously if we had a plan, a system, and an operation worthy of the name of civilian defense, the organization would be able to move in quickly in situations such as the recent storms. Instead, 10 inches of snow leaves our communities prostrate.

It seems to me, Mr. President, it is an offense against the public welfare for hospitals and homes for the aged and indigent to be without standby power facilities. Certainly if war should come to our shores, we could count on powerplants being prime targets. In such a contingency, whole communities and regional areas would be left crippled and helpless without emergency power units. Another vital need is for police organizations to have standby power to keep their field units operative.

In 1954 we saw the crisis which was created by Hurricane Hazel. That heavy blow from nature on the rampage revealed the glaring weaknesses in our homefront situation. Of course, there were many examples of individual heroism, and people everywhere responded magnificently to the hurricane's challenge. The fact remains, however, that Hurricane Hazel showed that we had not developed an overall efficient plan to cope with such emergencies, and we have not profited from that costly lesson of 4 years ago.

One of the most glaring deficiencies of the Eisenhower administration is the way it has made civilian defense an abused stepchild of the Federal family. It would be hard to find anywhere a group of people with poorer morale than the employees of the Civilian Defense Administration, through no fault of their own.

In a big emergency, are we to evacuate the civilian centers or take to the shelters? Where are the shelters, and when will we have them if that is the present thinking? Is there a shelter plan; what is the starting date of construction; what is the target date for completion; and, how does it all mesh with our military defense plans?

Earlier this year I called for a dispersal of the United States Government agencies away from Washington. At that time I called for moving the Capitol to some less vulnerable place than Washington. True, it might not be necessary to move the Congress itself until such time as enemy attack or invasion might absolutely require that Congress, and even the President, vacate Washington.

But we cannot wait until the enemy actually attacks to disperse our Government agencies. We can get out from under a snowstorm, a hurricane, and other natural disasters which exist for only a brief period. But I shudder to think of what would happen to civilian and military operations if the enemy were to strike the existing concentration of Government facilities now crowded into the metropolitan Washington area. It is time for serious thought to be given to dispersing the Government to the more remote and widespread areas of the Nation.

I am wondering, Mr. President, if the reason we do not have a well rounded, intelligent, realistic civilian-defense program is that there has been a studied effort to sugarcoat the real dangers inherent in the present world situation.

It makes no sense to be spending $40 billion a year on armament on the one hand and, on the other, failing to produce an adequate, workable, ready-to-go civilian-defense plan. If one is justified—and there is no denying it—the other is needed today. It was needed yesterday.

In the next war—and heaven forbid that it should come—Main Street will be the frontline. Are we to assume that those charged with our national defense regard our civilian population as expendable?

Our unpreparedness to cope with a homefront emergency cries for corrective action. Such action cannot come a day too soon.

## FORTHCOMING 80TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION OF FORMER SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the greatest of Senators in our era will celebrate his 80th birthday on March 28, 1958, an occasion when many of his friends expect to be with him in New York for that event.

I refer to Herbert H. Lehman, illustrious statesman in our Nation and in the world, who retired voluntarily in January of 1957, after an outstanding career in his own State, in world affairs, and in the United States Senate.

I know of no person of today who so aptly fits the description which his friend, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, once applied to Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska—"old in years but young in heart." This applies to Herbert Lehman, too. He may be approaching the beginning of his ninth decade, but he sees the world's problems with vision, enlightenment, and bold spirit. I well remember the day in January of 1955, when he prophetically warned us younger liberals in the Senate that we could not postpone the active consideration of civil-rights legislation in the name of party harmony. Herbert Lehman was alone that day, but he was right and all the rest of us were wrong.

Despite his proximity to 80, Herbert Lehman was never more active or prominent. He has just settled successfully a strike of garment workers in his native community of New York. He is still crusading for legislation in the realm of human rights and civil liberties. He is honorary chairman of the committee heralding the 10th anniversary of a cause close to his heart and emotions—the establishment of that outpost of democracy and culture in the Middle East, the Republic of Israel.

Mr. President, I believe the finest tribute to this genuine statesman, and to his gracious wife, Edith, is to ask unanimous consent to print in the body of the RECORD a splendid article entitled "Lehman at 80: Young Elder Statesman," which was written by the distinguished writer, Miss Barbara Ward, and appeared in the New York Times Sunday magazine for March 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEHMAN AT 80: YOUNG ELDER STATESMAN

(By Barbara Ward)

These are times that are in urgent need of wisdom. Revolutionary upheaval abroad, political uncertainty and economic stagnation at home, and everywhere a sense of pressure and personal foreboding make us anxious, as we have rarely been before, to be given some clues through the labyrinth, to see some possibility of effective thought and action in our troubled age.

For this reason there are signs of a new respect for the voice of experience. People are more ready to admit that there may be something to learn from history. Biographies of the best political leaders become best sellers. And men who have left the arena of public affairs are more likely to be consulted and respected as elder statesmen than left to political oblivion.

Certainly in the case of Herbert Lehman, who celebrates his 80th birthday this Friday, the decision to retire from public affairs—which he took in 1956—has not been followed by much lessening in public influence. He is active in the highest councils of the Democratic Party; he works on such influential private bodies as the Fund for the Republic; he is involved in myriad activities for the Jewish community. His successful mediation in the recent garment workers' strike is only one of a multitude of public responsibilities which come to him, largely unsought, in his role as one of the most eminent of America's retired leaders. He may have withdrawn from public affairs, but they show little sign of withdrawing from him.

One reason for this is, of course, that few careers could have prepared a man more fittingly for the part of elder statesman. He alone in the last 100 years has occupied all the highest elective posts in New York State, the most populous and powerful State in the Union. Twice elected lieutenant governor, four times governor, and twice chosen for the Senate, he has a record that in itself would stamp him as a uniquely successful public servant. Yet before he ever entered politics—which he did in support of Al Smith's campaign in 1928—he had already made a career for himself in private banking which would have satisfied the ambitions of most of his contemporaries. And for good measure, during his 3 years as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), he brought into being and directed the largest working international program the world has ever known.

Here, then, is a career that has had the widest possible scope. Private business, State and Federal politics, the new field of

international administration—there is virtually no area of public or private affairs of which Herbert Lehman has not had some direct experience. In fact, if one had decided to invent a life most likely to lead to the achievement of elder statesmanship, it would have been difficult to devise anything more suitable or complete.

Yet "the Governor," as he is still affectionately known to millions of New Yorkers, does not conform too well to the idea most of us hold of an elder statesman—one whom we tend to see sitting calmly in some well-upholstered library, or on a park bench, watching the world go by, recalling benevolently the events of earlier years and letting fall the analogies and comparisons which mature experience draws from them. If this is the arche-type of an elder statesman, then the Governor is something else again.

Few people of his years look back less. Few minds seem so eager to attack the problems of today and to look to the possible lines of policy for tomorrow. If past events are recalled, it is simply to illustrate some contemporary comment. Nor is that comment likely to be remarkable chiefly for its detachment and perspective. Herbert Lehman is not detached when it comes to the struggles of our day; he is still in there fighting. It is not so much age and maturity that strike you; it is a mind and a vigor that refuse to grow old.

If you talk to him these days, his first concern is our current crisis—the crisis of economic stagnation in America, the leaderless drifting of the free nations abroad. He attacks strongly the choice he believes the administration is trying to make between guns and butter, between security and welfare.

"Why can't we realize," he says, "that the answer to both problems lies in our ability to grow? Here we are in a recession. I don't think it will be on the scale of 1929. On the other hand, I do not think the President was right in suggesting an upturn this spring. But why, why do we permit a falling off in production at all? We need a great reservoir of strength with which to counter the Russians, and certainly we are not going to build one by allowing production to decline.

"The only sane way to look at our economy is on the basis of need. We need defense—but we need education, housing, and health expenditures fully as much. Yet the administration seems not to realize that it is precisely by budgeting for our basic needs that the Government can play its part in stimulating our economy to steady expansion. To talk of what we can afford makes no sense at all since by deciding not to afford, say, schools or houses, we help to perpetuate the recession and so deprive ourselves of the resources with which to build those schools and houses.

"What we need today is a great surge of growth linked to basic need. What the administration offers is a further cutting down on genuine social necessities, and hence a continuing recession. It comes down to this: If our economy grows at a steady pace, the yearly expansion in our productive resources will take care of both guns and butter. But cutting back induces recession, recession is used as an argument for further cutting back and before we know where we are, the Russians will be out ahead. This is budgetary nonsense."

The Governor would like to see the same dynamic concept of linking growth to genuine need introduced into the Free World's international relations. His experience in UNRRA taught him what it means to give people the basic hope of livelihood. UNRRA was not simply an exercise in relief; it was a vast adventure in recovery and reconstruction. It rebuilt roads, restocked railways, repaired harbors, brought in the machinery and set people to work once more. Wherever it operated, on either side of what was then by no means so iron a curtain, it brought hope, made friends for America, and underlined the solidarity of the human family. As one old peasant woman told Herbert Lehman: "For us, UNRRA is a holy word."

Since that effort of recovery proved possible then, and since its principles were vindicated all over again in the Marshall plan, why cannot the Free World adopt the program of joint action for international growth as a lasting principle of its diplomacy?

"We laid the foundations of the future," says Governor Lehman. "We gave back hope. Today, foreign aid on a lasting basis and aimed at basic growth could do the same. I have again and again urged such a policy to bring a measure of stability to the Middle East. A regional development scheme for the whole area might make a new approach possible to the problem of achieving a peaceful settlement. At least, it is hard to see any line of advance without one.

"And in general, we cannot hope to meet the Russians' new entry into the field of foreign aid unless we have sustained, thought-through and generally accepted policies of our own. Above all, we must find some bedrock for our efforts in the genuine needs of the peoples in less developed areas. If we aim at them, we can do what UNRRA did—we can re-create hope."

You do not need to talk long with Herbert Lehman to discover how central to all his thinking is this sense of people and their needs. The core of his faith in the Democratic Party is his belief that it has defended and will defend the interests of ordinary men and women who have neither the wealth nor the influence nor the confidence fully to defend themselves. It explains the contemporary emphasis in his thinking, for whatever else may change, the needs, troubles and disabilities of ordinary men and women have a habit of remaining constant.

This is the spur that keeps the Governor from relaxing among his years and honors. This is, in a sense, his whole philosophy of government, the central theme of his political activity, the settled conviction of his mature experience. He would probably not claim a very elaborate or a highly intellectualized approach to public affairs; for him the issue is much more direct. He sees politics as the field of activity where some men struggle to benefit themselves and their own interests, and where other men must, if there is to be any public good, work for those who cannot help themselves. The conviction that he himself must belong to the second group goes back to the earliest and deepest experiences of his life.

His parents came to America to escape the restrictions placed on the liberal Jewish community of Germany. In spite of the wealth and success that later crowned this migration, his family did not forget the precariousness of their freedom. The children were raised to treasure the rights of ordinary citizens and to react sharply against the threat of abridgements to any group. "We were rebels by necessity," the Governor recalls.

Even so, the security of material wealth might have lulled this sensitiveness had not Herbert Lehman's father and one of his early teachers, Frank Irwin, taken him, as a growing boy, to confront the reality of misery and poverty and dirt in New York's slums and tenements. The image of hopeless need was fixed in his adolescent imagination. Maturity only confirmed his commitment to alleviating, by all action within his power—private, philanthropic, public, political—the miseries and burdens laid on shoulders too weak to raise the load themselves.

In 1928, the sense of how much could be accomplished by direct political action led him to give up a highly successful banking career at the top of the boom when the possibilities of piling fortune upon fortune appeared endless. Today, 30 years later—30 years of unremitting work for the social needs of ordinary men and women—the Governor's heavy mail testifies to people's belief that time has not abated his concern.

Herbert Lehman is thus a profoundly popular political figure—popular in the sense of finding his deepest political satisfaction in work for the mass of the people. Yet there are many shades of meaning to the word "popular" which do not suit the Governor in the least degree. "Popular" has been used to describe the demagog, who carves his own way to office.

This is not Herbert Lehman's type of popularity. His speeches are simple, almost austere. They aim very little at emotion. They use logic. They are loaded with facts. Rational conviction, not emotional sway, is what they seek. People are often at a loss, after listening to a steady, almost pedestrian address, to account for the Governor's profound impact. The reason is that it is an impact of quiet conviction, never a swamping of judgment in swelling periods that raise the roof and extinguish the mind.

Nor has the Governor been popular in the sense of allowing the popular mood of the moment to guide his own decisions. In a decisive test during the McCarthy hysteria—a test held on the eve of a crucial senatorial contest—Herbert Lehman voted against a crude piece of anti-Communist legislation. "I will not betray the people of my State," he said, "in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold. * * * My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I shall cast my vote for the liberties of our people."

In short, the Governor's concern for the people's needs is not a politician's maneuver to secure power. It is not a pandering to the popular mood of the moment. It springs from profound convictions about the nature and dignity of man which were as evident when his career began as they are today. The Governor had no need to discover principles after having first made a political name for himself. The principles came first and guided all the rest.

In a recent speech the Governor said: "I believe that what is mainly lacking from the spirit of these times * * * is a true sense of purpose and direction. We do not really know where we are going or why. The protection of the status quo has become a major public force and motive. * * * Theoretically the public favors some changes at home and abroad, but is generally unwilling to exert real effort, make any real sacrifice, or take any real risks to bring such changes about."

Those who have had in any measure the joy of knowing him, as the years have unfolded his profoundly rich and rewarding career, will be tempted on his 80th birthday to take up the Book of Wisdom and read there once again the description of the just man: "He shall show forth the discipline he hath learnt and shall glory in the law of the covenant of the Lord. Many shall praise his wisdom and it shall not be forgotten. And the memory of him shall not depart from the earth."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Oregon in his tribute to former Senator Lehman. The article he has asked to have printed in the RECORD carries words of wisdom for our people and our Government, in our current economic crises. Herbert Lehman's answer is to reject the choice that the administration seems to be placing between butter and guns or security and welfare. The great question confronting this Congress, according to former

Senator Lehman, is "Why do we permit a falling-off in production at all?" In the words of Herbert Lehman:

We need a great reservoir of strength with which to counter the Russians, and certainly we are not going to build one by allowing production to decline. The only sure way * * *. What we need today is a great surge of growth linked to basic need. What the administration offers is a further cutting down on genuine social necessities, and hence a continuing recession * * * cutting back induces recession, recession is used as an argument for further cutting back and before we know where we are, the Russians will be out ahead. This is budgetary nonsense.

## PROPOSED FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION JURISDICTION TO PREVENT MONOPOLISTIC ACTS IN MEAT AND MEAT-PRODUCTS COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to refer, at the beginning of the Senate session tomorrow, Senate bill 1356, Calendar No. 706, the meatpackers bill, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions that Senate bill 1356 be reported to the Senate not later than Monday, April 21, 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise only to ask for clarification. As I understand, the request implies, of course, that modifications may be made in the bill before it is reported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would be perfectly within its rights in making any suggestions it desired to make. Even if it were to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, I would not object, because I am confident we could defeat it on the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and probably I shall not object—I want it understood that, in connection with the request, there is no waiver whatsoever of jurisdiction on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall give the Senator publicly the assurance which I gave him in private.

Mr. WATKINS. While the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may wish to make suggestions, the bill which the Committee on the Judiciary reported will also still be before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A new bill may be reported.

Mr. WATKINS. But the other bill will still be before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will not be on the calendar if it is referred. It will have to be reported from either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The purpose of referring the bill to the two committees is to permit them to study it and see if they have any amendments or suggestions to offer, in the hope that the two committees may get together.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I cannot hear what is being said.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I suggest that the majority leader repeat what he just said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object until I have heard what is going on. This is a private conversation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume that the purpose of referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to permit the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to sit down with the Committee on the Judiciary and attempt to find an area of agreement.

I thought I had cleared the proposed agreement with the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Wyoming. What will occur when the two committees get together, I am unable to predict. I assume that if they could get together and amend the bill, it would be reported to the Senate and placed upon the calendar, and the Senate would give it prompt consideration. If the committees did not amend the bill, I assume that the Committee on the Judiciary could report the bill to the Senate, and that it could be taken up again on motion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the agreement be altered by inserting at the proper place, where the proposed agreement now calls for a report by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by the 21st of April, language requiring a report by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with its recommendation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to accept that modification, if it is satisfactory to the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I heard the statement of the majority leader that the purpose was to allow the two committees to meet jointly and consider the bill. With that understanding, and in the light of the statement just made, I have no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before an agreement is entered into——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to make a further suggestion, namely, that the unanimous-consent agreement be effective at the end of the morning hour, because I wish tomorrow's morning hour to be free to any Member of the Senate who may wish to make some comment on the measure before it goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Illinois nods in the affirmative. Is that agreeable?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is agreeable to the majority leader, we have an agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How does the Senator from Wyoming desire to again modify the request?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have the agreement in my hand, and I shall indicate the modification.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the unanimous consent agreement, the bill was to be reported after tomorrow's morning hour.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Let me read the proposed unanimous consent agreement:

I ask unanimous consent to refer, at the beginning of the Senate session tomorrow—

I would like to change that to read—

effective at the end of the morning hour tomorrow—

I continue to read the agreement:

S. 1356, Calendar No. 706, the meatpackers bill, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions that Senate bill 1356 be reported back to the Senate Calendar—

I would insert here:

With the recommendations of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—

I continue to read:

not later than Monday, April 21, 1958.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will accept that modification, although it is not necessary to have it incorporated. Any Senator has the privilege to talk on any subject during the morning hour. However, if it pleases any Senator to have that modification added, I accept it. I hope the Chair will put the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to make it clear that I am not making this request out of idle motives nor out of any fear that the Senate is not ready to pass, but out of a spirit of fairness. There are Members of the Senate who are not present who have indicated to me that they desire to make some comments on the floor in support of the bill, but I am willing to have the participation of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent agreement as modified?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Inasmuch as S. 1356 is the pending business of the Senate, Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have included, at the conclusion of my brief remarks, a letter received from Mr. G. F. Chambers, president of Cascade Meats, Inc., Salem, Oreg., and a wire from Mr. H. Leland Jacobsmuhlen of the Arrow Meat Co., Forest Grove, Oreg. Mr. Chambers and Mr. Jacobsmuhlen represent independent meatpacking firms with well-established businesses, serving the retailers of their respective local areas. As small-business people, they see in S. 1356 a measure that will restore to the Federal Trade Commission the authority to prevent unfair competition in the merchandising of all products sold by meatpackers.

The desire to block what is called unfair competition has brought into the ranks of this bill's supporters such organizations as the National Candy Wholesalers Association and the National Retail Dry Goods Association. This was emphasized to me when the National Candy Wholesalers Association held its meeting a few days ago in Washington. One of its officers, Ralph Jones, of La Grande, Oreg., a constituent of mine

who operates a wholesale business serving retailers in the Blue Mountain area, came to my office to stress that, among bills of great concern to the small-business men comprising this association, there was strong support for the O'Mahoney-Watkins bill. These candy wholesalers are small-business men who deal with other small-business men. In common with the independent packing firms, they believe that all firms serving the food industry should be under the same laws and the same enforcement. That enforcement, they believe, logically belongs under the Federal Trade Commission, in view of the Commission's experience in dealing with unfair practices and the body of court decisions supporting their opinions.

They are especially concerned that there are those outside the meatpacking industry, who, by the device of acquiring a minor interest in a meatpacking plant, may escape regulation by the FTC.

The opinion of my constituents is entirely understandable, when one looks at the record of enforcement under the Packers and Stockyards Act. As brought out in the hearings last summer, the division supposed to enforce the law consists of only three people; two agricultural marketing specialists and one stenographer. For the past 19 years, the report on the bill brings out, not a single cease-and-desist order dealing with monopolistic practices by packers has been issued. Furthermore, it is revealed, that the Department of Agriculture has not sought appropriations for this purpose.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASCADE MEATS, INC.,
*Salem, Oreg., February 12, 1958.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It is our understanding that within the next few weeks, Senate bill S. 1356 by Senators O'MAHONEY and WATKINS, will be brought to the floor of the Senate. We wish to reiterate our interest in the passage of this bill—as amended by Senator YOUNG—and urge your support.

This bill will retain in the Department of Agriculture exclusive jurisdiction over livestock transactions in interstate commerce, but will restore to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent unfair competition in the merchandising of all products sold by meatpackers.

Recently the Department of Agriculture has made some gestures indicating their willingness to attempt more rigid enforcement under title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act, but past performances—no cease-and-desist orders since 1938—would show that vigorous enforcement would be much more likely under a proven enforcement agency such as the Federal Trade Commission. The latter agency has a trained staff and would actively investigate any complaints filed.

May we count on your support?

Yours very truly,

G. F. CHAMBERS,
*President.*

---

FOREST GROVE, OREG.,
*February 19, 1958.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

For the welfare and growth of a strong independent meatpacking industry on the Pacific coast, I strongly urge you to support O'Mahoney-Watkins bill, S. 1356.

ARROW MEAT CO.
H. LELAND JACOBSMUHLEN.

---

## ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the Economic Indicators for March 1958, which became available this morning.

The document, which is published monthly by the Government Printing Office, now has a circulation of 6,500 copies every month. Public Law 120, 81st Congress, 1st session, authorized the publication of this document. That was 10 years ago. I am told that approximately $60,000 has been collected by the Superintendent of Documents from the sale of the publication. This year approximately $13,000 were received.

MATERIAL COMES FROM PRESIDENT'S ADVISERS

We must bear in mind that all of this material comes from the Council of Economic Advisers, the personnel of which is chosen by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The statistics are gathered by expert members of the staffs of all of the departments which deal in economic statistics. The Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and the staff of the General Economic Committee, all have a hand in writing and editing this document.

INDICATOR HAS EARNED $60,000 FOR GOVERNMENT

Inasmuch as I was the sponsor of Public Law 120 of the 81st Congress, 1st session, 10 years ago, which was approved by the President on June 23, 1949, I take some satisfaction in the fact that by the introduction of the bill I have brought about an income of $60,000 in the last 10 years to the Superintendent of Documents.

The reason why I call the attention of the Senate to this matter now is that I believe every Member of the Senate should read the document. It is available without charge, of course, to Members of Congress.

NATIONAL PRODUCT IS DROPPING

On page 2 there is a table containing figures showing the gross national product or expenditure. The gross national product represents the total national output of goods and services, at current market prices. It measures this output in terms of the expenditures by which these goods are acquired for final use in legal markets.

The gross national product is declining and has been steadily declining from about shortly after the first of July 1957. Personal consumption expenditures are declining. Government purchases of goods and services are rising. Gross private domestic investment is declining. This is a fact which every Member of Congress ought to know.

PERSONAL INCOME IS DECLINING

On page 3 are the figures and tables showing the national income. I should like to read one sentence from the top of this page:

Compensation of employees was $1.7 billion (seasonally adjusted annual rate) lower in the fourth quarter than in the third quarter of 1957.

On page 4 are shown sources of personal income. This table shows that the total personal income is declining, and that labor income is declining.

The sentence which introduces this material on page 4 reads:

Personal income in February was at seasonably adjusted annual rate of $342 billion, about $2 billion lower than in January. Wages and salaries dropped more than $2 billion; other types of income changed little.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES WILL DROP

In this connection I say that in the President's budget, on page 884, the President, through his experts in the Bureau of the Budget, estimated that individual income taxes would be increased by $1,300,000,000 in the next year. Instead of an increase of $1,300,000,000, the drop, as is attested to by the Council of Economic Advisers, is a drop of $2 billion.

CORPORATE PROFITS ARE DOWN

There are several other items in the document to which attention should be drawn. I wish to read the following sentence from the top of page 8:

Corporate profits in the third quarter of 1957 were slightly lower than profits in the second quarter. Profits before taxes were $1 billion (seasonally adjusted annual rate) higher and profits after taxes $0.5 billion higher than in the third quarter of 1956.

It will be observed that these figures are a comparison of the third quarter of 1957 with the second quarter. While this document was in preparation, the First National-City Bank of New York made its own report, in its economic letter for March, that some 610 corporations had reported a net income 16 percent lower in the fourth quarter of 1957 than in the third quarter.

Using this report as an indicator, and referring to the advices I have received from the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, I can say without hesitation that the trend of corporate profits is down.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT HAS FALLEN

On page 9, the chart and the figures show the gross private domestic investment trend is downward. The introductory sentences read as follows:

Gross private domestic investment fell $5.2 billion (seasonally adjusted annual rate) in the fourth quarter of 1957. The reduction in inventories accounted for most of the decline.

PLANT EXPENDITURES ARE DOWN

On page 10, a decline is shown in expenditures for new plant and equipment. Total expenditures for 1957 were running at a total of $36.9 billion. For the 2 months of January and February 1957, they had fallen to an estimated level of $32.07 billion. That is a decline of over

$4 billion. To reverse this trend, we cannot depend upon any recovery in March or April or May.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS INCREASING

Those who are interested in employment should turn to page 11. The status of the labor force is described in the following words:

Unemployment increased to 5.2 million in February, as employment declined further and as women and young persons entered the labor market.

State programs for the insurance of unemployed persons constituted only 2.9 percent, in 1952, of those covered by employment insurance and collecting the same, whereas the estimate for February 1958, is 7.6 percent. More than that, in 1952, 1,064,000 persons were covered by all unemployment insurance programs. The number estimated for February 1957 is 3,375,000.

PRICES RISE THOUGH ECONOMIC TREND IS DOWNWARD

Nonagricultural employment is down. The average weekly hours of labor is down. The average weekly earnings are down. Industrial production has dropped approximately 16 points on the 1947–49 index. New construction is down. Sales and inventories in manufacturing and trade also show the customary downward trend, as do both exports and imports of merchandise.

On the other hand—and this is worthy of noting—prices are up. The graphs and tables on consumer prices are to be found on page 23. Using prices for 1947 through 1949 as an index of 100, prices have been rising month by month through 1957, closing in November and December at 121.6. The only month from 1958 reported in this document is January, and that shows another increase, to 122.3. I am advised by the staff that the index for February is also up.

Food and rent are conspicuous items in the increase, and this is also the case with respect to transportation and medical care.

CALLS FOR REVISION OF FIGURES ON ECONOMY

In conclusion, let me say that in my opinion the Bureau of the Budget faces the unavoidable duty to revise the figures which were submitted to us in January. Increased expenditures for mutual security now being asked by the President above the levels of the January budget make it essential that the Congress be given the plain facts about the economy. Reduction of taxes is not a cure of the economic disease from which we suffer. It is only a plaster, except in certain areas, as, for example, excise taxes on automobiles and other commodities which are not now selling.

INCREASED PRODUCTION BEGETS HIGHER BUDGET RECEIPTS

What the country needs most of all is a program to increase budget receipts by increasing production. Congress and the Executive must find the ways and means by which to stimulate the development of natural resources which will produce more products and, inevitably, higher budget receipts for the Government.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now holding a series of hearings on the development of domestic mineral resources. It should be remembered by the makers of the budget and by the whole executive branch of the Government, including the White House, that mineral lands are subject to leasing under a royalty system which increases the income of the Government of the United States. Here is an opportunity where we can produce some of the revenue which the Government needs.

---

## REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in a totalitarian state, the coin of the realm is the order of the dictator.

In our democracy, however, defense strength can only come from economic strength.

More than 84 cents of every tax dollar now levied against the American citizen by the Congress goes to pay for past or possible future wars.

Over 60 cents of that tax dollar is for current national defense.

Bending under those taxes, our people nevertheless are willing to pay them. They believe their country can spend as much to defend its freedoms as any other country can spend to destroy those freedoms.

They see no logic being the richest in the graveyard.

They want strength—spiritual, economic, and physical strength.

Above all, they desire to maintain their liberty, and are willing and anxious to make any necessary sacrifice to that end.

In turn, the citizen has the right to demand of his Government maximum defense at minimum cost.

It is now generally recognized that the structure of the Defense Department of the United States, based on the way it is set up under the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is one of the most inefficient organizations ever created.

During the almost eleven years the present National Security Act has been in operation, the American people have paid out nearly three hundred and fifty billion dollars for defense support; the American Military Establishment suffered its greatest defeat to an outside power at the Chosen Reservoir; and, whereas 10 years ago the military strength of this country was supreme everywhere, on the sea, under the sea, on the ground, and in the air, as of today we have certainly lost our lead to the Communists in 2 of those categories—and, unless our policies are sharply revised, will lose it shortly in a third.

President Eisenhower, talking in the field in which he had had most of his experience, said in his annual address to the Congress last January 9:

Recently I have had under special study the never-ending problem of efficient organization, complicated as it is by new weapons. Soon my own conclusions will be finalized. I shall promptly take such executive action as is necessary and, in a separate message, I shall present appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

* * * A major purpose of military organization is to achieve real unity in the Defense Establishment in all the principal features of military activity. Of all these one of the most important to our Nation's security is strategic planning and control. This work must be done under unified direction.

That statement was very gratifying. As Assistant Secretary of War, under the instructions of President Truman and Secretary of War Patterson, and with the advice of the then Chief of Staff of the Army, General Eisenhower, I tried to monitor through Congress the unification bill which was wanted by all at that time; and therefore know as well as most the degree of the failure in what finally became law.

Also, I know what the results of this failure have meant to the security and prosperity of the United States.

Many able and dedicated persons believed at that time that it was best the proposed new head of the proposed new Defense Department should have but feeble control over the administrative reins, bound in by detailed legislative restriction.

So despite our now having spent these hundreds of billions of dollars, so much has been and is being wasted that the Nation now realizes it has become alarmingly weak vis-a-vis the great and growing military strength of the Communist conspiracy.

I still have confidence in Secretary McElroy. I am glad he is coming to Congress soon with a reorganization proposal for the Department of Defense, in an effort to operate efficiently the current administrative maze which is the Pentagon.

Scores of prominent private citizens have been working on this matter over these "10 years of waste"—those on the Hoover Commission of 1949, on the Rockefeller Commission incident to Reorganization Plan 6 of 1953, and on the current studies now being conducted by the advisory group which was asked to assist by Secretary McElroy and the President. These people know well that communism can ultimately destroy us economically as well as militarily.

Mr. President, unless this time the structure of the Defense Department is reorganized to represent progress instead of continuing to represent tradition, our position will become very serious indeed.

The strength of this country is the only strength left in the Free World which can challenge the aggression of communism. If we go down, the world will belong to the Communists.

Therefore, we must get strong and stay strong. At the same time, we cannot afford to continue to waste wholesale the taxpayers' money.

We can, and must, take whatever steps necessary to preserve our freedom and prosperity by establishing plans for maximum defense at minimum cost.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shaking Up the Pentagon," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 31, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAKING UP THE PENTAGON

One of the most urgent issues before the administration, the Congress, and the Pentagon is the reorganization of the Nation's defense machinery. The need for it has been overwhelmingly attested; but there is strong opposition in the services and in Congress.

It is encouraging to learn that the administration's preliminary reorganization planning includes greatly increased power for the Secretary of Defense. As President Eisenhower has firmly committed himself to seeing through the reorganization, it can be assumed that he himself is pushing this point. He is also the general who told the West Point cadets in June 1945, that "all forces must work as a unit" and that "if I had my way they would all be in the same uniform."

But just what does greatly increased power for the Secretary mean? The Joint Chiefs of Staff as a system have long been under fire and radical changes therein have been suggested by the Rockefeller report and by reliable witnesses before Congress. On the other hand, Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, in testimony released this week, stressed the good job he said the Joint Chiefs of Staff were doing in military planning for short- and long-range emergencies. That is only a small part of their work. But this report has led to the expectation in Washington that there will be no recommendation for a single unified command. Why should there not be?

The present system of assigning roles and missions to the Army, Navy, and Air Force might well be supplanted with a unified command system executing a definite plan of military strategy in which the test of a service role would be only the nature of the task. That would give some badly needed centralization.

Capable and dedicated men that the Joint Chiefs are, they have strong loyalties to their own services. It goes against human nature to expect them to serve both as operating heads of their services, and strategic planners for their country, as well as to give unprejudiced opinions on military matters before the Nation.

As matters now stand the Secretary of Defense frequently turns to outside consultants or to advisory committees on major questions. That is one reason why the Department of Defense, which once had only 9 Assistant Secretaries, now has nearly 50. Is it any wonder that there is confusion and rivalry when information has to filter through such a bureaucracy? Does not such a system almost insure that the top civilian echelon many times finds itself dangerously removed from top operating military men?

It is conceivable that the reorganization might well approach something like the plan advanced by Gen. Carl Spaatz, a former Air Force Chief now retired, who recently proposed:

"The three services should be placed under the control of a single Secretary of Defense served by a limited number of Assistant Secretaries. The civilian departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force should be abolished. A military Chief of Staff with a small staff of senior career officers completely detached from the three services and a few scientists and technologists should advise the Secretary of Defense in matters of military policy. The services should be commanded by officers not members of the staff but answerable to the Secretary."

The only major problem in giving the Secretary of Defense a single Chief of Staff would be the old fear of the "man on horseback." That has happened in some countries but is it likely to happen in the United States where the Chief of Staff would be appointed by the President, approved by the Senate, and bossed by a civilian in the Office of the Secretary of Defense? If our democracy ever got to the point where it could be taken over by a Chief of Staff, the chances are it would be pretty far gone, anyway.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "No Futile Compromise, Mr. McElroy," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 11, 1958, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO FUTILE COMPROMISE, MR. MCELROY

Reports seeping out of Washington indicate Secretary of Defense McElroy and his advisory panel will recommend a wide but not drastic reorganization of the Pentagon. Apparently the Secretary will not suggest a single Chief of Staff, not change the present Chiefs of Staff setup.

If this proves true, it will be immensely disappointing to the country. It will ignore counsel of some of our most hardheaded military experts.

Much worse, it will leave the Defense Establishment in a frustrating, sluggish maze.

The result to competent United States defense planning and operation would be hobbling and erosive. The present system has resulted in such intense service rivalries as to produce a public scandal.

The redtape and indecisiveness, resulting from lack of firm direction, has hampered most effective planning. It has either caused, or been unable to prevent, duplicating service programs, all vying for control of missile development and space rocketry.

The consequence—Russian triumph in space-missile fields.

The proposals of the Secretary and his study panel will be given to the President. Mr. Eisenhower has shown a desire to put things right in the Pentagon.

The Nation wants military leadership to bring about a reorganization of the Defense Department. Never has a time for major surgery been more favorable.

If the McElroy program does not strike at the core of the problem and radically revise the Chiefs of Staff system, President Eisenhower ought to demand such a change.

Probably Mr. Eisenhower is the only man in the Nation who can achieve an urgently needed reform of America's military setup. He has strong views about the danger and lashups resulting from interservice feuds. He certainly recalls his own frustrations as Army Chief of Staff.

It should be elemental in the military that final decision be made, after consultation among staff chiefs, by one top commander. That is true in all echelons—except among the Chiefs of Staff.

These decisions, on policy, defense strategy, in all areas, would be subject to approval or disapproval by a civilian Defense Secretary, ultimately by the President. There is no hazard under such arrangement of a Prussian-like general staff, or the "man on horseback."

Manifestly, reduction of the top-heavy Secretary staff and the mushroomed civilian force in Mr. McElroy's office should be made. Other revisions in functioning could ease the choked channels. But the Pentagon mess demands radical change to abandon the Chiefs of Staff system—slothful, sometimes obstructionist. This is not time for piddling compromise or frail palliatives.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also that an editorial entitled "Elihu Root's Example," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 20, 1958, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELIHU ROOT'S EXAMPLE

It is disappointing to hear that Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy has been overtaken by what seems to be a spirit of lassitude and resignation carrying with it strong indications that there will be no basic reorganization of the Pentagon. When he took office last October high hopes were held that he would master the Pentagon bureaucracy. Now disturbing reports come from Washington that the bureaucracy seems to be mastering him.

It is Secretary McElroy's job to give this Nation the best defense possible. It is not his job to defend the national budget, the administration, the Republican National Committee, or the vested interests of the armed services. Several times he has said that he was going to straighten out the Pentagon; and several times President Eisenhower has said that he was behind him in his efforts.

What has to be done has been apparent for many months. The Joint Chiefs of Staff system obviously is not working. Harmful service rivalries are rife. Millions of dollars are being wasted. The missiles mess still exists and is even one of the prime causes for the controversy over Army, Navy, and Air Force service roles and missions. Although the space age is on the threshold, there is no assurance that even the concepts of strategy for today are clearly defined.

The whole story in a nutshell is told by what is said to be happening with Secretary McElroy's decision to increase the military budget by $1.5 billion next year. After deciding that spending ought to go up by that amount, the Secretary is reported to have asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff to develop a program for the use of the money. They replied that as a body they lacked the technical resources to chart a detailed program.

Mr. McElroy therefore had to turn to the three services individually, each of which does command technical planning resources. What he got from them, however, was not a single program for spending 1.5 billions in the way best addressed to overall national security, but 3 separate programs, each drafted from a special-interest point of view. As could have been predicted, the Air Force program gave the lion's share of the funds to the Air Force, the Army's program gave it to the Army, and the Navy's to the Navy. This leaves the Secretary just where he was before.

True enough, the labor of straightening out the Pentagon is somewhat like that which confronted Hercules when he undertook to clean out the Augean stables. But the task is far from impossible. Elihu Root, like Mr. McElroy, knew nothing about military affairs when he was talked into becoming Secretary of War from 1899 to 1904. Yet, Root put his mind to the task and, backed by Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt, brought the military managerial revolution to this country.

He broke the power of the squabbling Army bureau chiefs, established a General Staff, instituted officer schools, and reorganized the Army thoroughly. As Newton Baker, who became Secretary of War under President Wilson, remarked: "Without that contribution from him, the participation of the United States in the World War would necessarily have been a confused, ineffective, and discreditable episode."

There is no reason why Secretary McElroy could not go ahead just as Elihu Root did. The entire Defense Department needs the same kind of housecleaning that Elihu Root gave the War Department at the turn of the century.

## MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning to present the mutual security program as recommended by the President for the fiscal year 1959. Mr. Dulles made an outstanding statement to the committee.

Because the mutual security program will shortly come before the Senate for consideration, and even though the statement by Mr. Dulles will appear in the report of the committee, it seemed to me to be well worth while to have his statement printed in the RECORD, so that every Member of the Senate may know the administration's position concerning this very important proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the statement made by Secretary of State Dulles before the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning in support of the mutual security program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM, MARCH 24, 1958

Mr. Chairman, I appear on behalf of the mutual-security program as recommended by the President for the fiscal year 1959.

### I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

This program is a continuation of tested security measures that have had their birth and growth during the postwar years. It has provided peace, and the opportunity which flows from a world environment of healthy societies of free men. Without this program our peace would be gravely endangered, and opportunity would disappear as hostile communism more and more closely encircled us until we became a beleaguered garrison state.

The basic concept of our mutual-security program is the concept of interdependence. The free nations, assaulted by Communist imperialism, must help each other if they are not to succumb, one by one.

We automatically accept that concept of interdependence in the case of open war. During the First World War there were 27 allied and associated powers. We helped each other, militarily and economically, to win victory.

During the Second World War 47 nations united their full resources, military and economic, in the cause of victory.

Now we are engaged in a cold war. We shall not emerge victorious unless, in this type of war also, we apply the concept of interdependence.

The soundness of mutual security is no longer a theory. It is a proven fact. Until its principles began to be applied, international communism took over nation after nation. Since the postwar collective-defense system began to be forged, international communism has neither taken over, nor subjected to armed attack, any nation which participated in that system. All members have contributed to security, and all have received security.

### II. THE SOVIET ECONOMIC-POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

Until a few years ago Communist imperialism relied primarily on a policy of threats, bluster, or armed action. Now the Communist leaders follow a new technique. Where they formerly treated all free nations as enemies, they now profess the greatest friendship toward them—particularly toward those which seek economic development.

In pursuing this course—backed with capital and skilled manpower—they have made offers of economic help to nations in all parts of the globe. They and other bloc nations have already entered into agreements with 16 nonbloc nations for lines of credit or grants totaling nearly $1,600,000,000 in economic assistance and an additional $400 billion for military assistance. They are also engaged in vigorous efforts to increase their trade with nations in all parts of the Free World.

Mr. Khrushchev has recently said:

"We declare war upon you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States of America is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

That is a warning to be heeded. It means that while we must, of course, deter war—whether general nuclear war or limited war—we must also prevent Communist absorption or envelopment of free nations by the more subtle means of economic penetration and political subversion.

### III. DETERRING WAR

First let us consider the problem of deterring war. We have treaties with over 40 nations which pledge aid to be given and received if armed attack occurs. These promises are important. But there is need also of military strength-in-being. Our program of mutual security has that as one of its principal purposes.

By this program our allies have vastly increased the effectiveness and numbers of their forces. We have contributed primarily weapons and material up to about $20 billion, while nations associated with us in the collective defense effort have made defense expenditures totaling $122 billion.

We have gained great reinforcement of the most powerful deterrent to aggression, that is our strategic air force and our naval might. This great power is heavily dependent on dispersed bases around the world. These are supplied by many of our allies and friends as part of their contribution to our mutual security effort.

Great as this mobile strategic power is, we cannot be sure that it alone will deter all aggression. The Free World must also have local forces to resist local aggression and give mobile power the opportunity for deployment.

Our associates in mutual security are willing to provide the great bulk of the needed conventional forces if we will provide some of the necessary arms and, in certain countries, some of the economic strength needed to support their military establishments.

The peace of our country and the peace of every free nation in the world today rests in the most literal sense on the combining of the forces of the United States with the forces of the rest of the Free World. Together they create an arch on which rests the safety of our homes and loved ones. The military assistance and defense support aspects of the mutual security program are the keystones in which security arch.

### IV. THE DEVELOPMENT NEED

It is not sufficient, as I indicated earlier, for us to rely solely on miltary defensive power. To achieve peace and security we must also counter the Communist efforts to manipulate for their own ends the intense economic aspirations of peoples in newly independent and less developed nations.

I have heard it said that we must not enter into a competition with the Soviet bloc in this field. My reply is that we are not entering into a competition with them. They are entering into competition with us. They are attempting to take over and pervert for their own uses the normal processes whereby, historically, nations that are not yet developed borrow abroad to get their own capital development under way. For example, in our own country's early history we borrowed great sums from foreign private investors with which we started our own transportation and industrial development.

We favor today the greatest possible participation by private capital in the development of the less developed areas of the world. However, the political risks in many of these countries are greater than private persons will assume. Unless there is to be a lapse in what have been the normal and historic means of developing less developed countries, our governmental funds must play a part. Failure to provide these funds would place great victories within the Communist grasp.

### V. THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM IN FISCAL YEAR 1959

If these are the challenges which confront us, what then must we do to surmount them and go forward?

An essential part of the answer is in the President's proposals now before you.

First, to maintain the peace, we must maintain the military strength of the Free World as a deterrent to Communist armed aggression.

The President has asked $1.8 billion for military assistance. Of this amount the great bulk will go to our NATO allies, essentially for modernization and missiles, and to Asian countries, such as Korea, Pakistan, Taiwan, and Iran which are separated from the full power of the Soviet bloc only by a border gate or a narrow strait.

The details of this military assistance program, and its essential role in support of our own defense effort, were presented to this committee last week by representatives of the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Closely related to our military assistance is our defense support program, for which the President has requested $835 million.

Defense support is proposed for 12 nations. Seventy percent intended for four countries: Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, and Turkey.

These 12 nations are collectively providing 3 million armed men in ground, air, and naval units located at strategic points around the perimeter of the Communist bloc. None of the 12 has the economic strength to support forces of the size we believe important to our common defense without the proposed economic assistance from us.

The second great purpose of our military security program is to deal realistically with the need of the peoples of the newly developing nations to make economic progress. We have the instruments for this in our well-established technical cooperation program and our newly created development loan fund.

This year we propose a moderate expansion in our technical cooperation, primarily to increase activity in a few countries where we now have programs and to undertake new programs in nations which have recently gained independence. The total requested for this program for 1959 is $142 million.

In addition we are requesting an increased authorization for the United Nations technical assistance program, to include participation in the important new special projects fund approved by the last General Assembly, and a continuation of our

regular program through the Organization of American States.

Our other vital instrument for promoting economic development is the development loan fund. It was recommended to the Congress last year, upon the basis of numerous public and private studies—particularly the excellent study and report by the Senate Special Committee on Foreign Aid—that a loan agency be established which would make it possible for the United States to help friendly nations develop their economies on a basis of self-help and mutual cooperation.

The Congress appropriated $300 million for the fund last year and authorized the appropriation of $625 million for the coming fiscal year. Since the appropriation of the funds for fiscal year 1959 is already authorized, your committee will not be called upon to act on the authorization. Nevertheless, I would like to take advantage of this occasion to make clear my belief that it is immensely important that the full amount of these funds be made available as part of the capital of the development loan fund. They are as important for the future safety of our country as any dollars appropriated for weapons.

The committee of conference on the authorizing bill last year recommended that the fund should in the future be established as a corporation. This is in accord with the views of the executive branch and we recommend to the Congress that this be done, in a form that will assure that lending by the fund will be fully coordinated with the foreign-policy interests of the Department of State, the mutual-security activities of the ICA, and the lending of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank.

For the special assistance program we are requesting $212 million. This aid is designed to meet certain important needs which cannot be met out of the other categories of aid. These needs include help to maintain political and economic stability in certain nations where we do not support substantial military forces and which are not therefore eligible for assistance under defense support. Special assistance is also designed to support such activities as assistance to West Berlin, to continue the worldwide malaria eradication program, and for other important uses.

Perhaps one of our most important needs is the ability to respond to new situations and new requirements which may arise in the course of the coming fiscal year. The President has asked a $200 million contingency fund for needs of this nature.

It would be reckless, in the light of conditions existing in the world today and the virtual certainty of Communist cold-war initiatives that we cannot now foresee, to leave the President without an emergency fund of at least this size.

Other programs, for which the President requests in the aggregate $106.6 million, will be dealt with in detail by subsequent witnesses.

VI. THE UNITED STATES ECONOMIC RECESSION

I know that many people—members of this Congress and their constituents—are concerned about the cost of our mutual-security program and about what is often referred to as a "foreign giveaway." This is even more true when there is an employment and business recession here in the United States and when there is much that needs to be done here at home.

I think we might all bear in mind three things:

First, this is no giveaway program but an absolutely essential part of our great national effort to maintain peace and opportunity for our country. Not to have this program would be a giveaway. We would then indeed give away to communism the control of a dozen or so nations with their hundreds of millions of people. We would indeed give away bases essential to our national peace and security. We would indeed give away the access which we and other nations have to essential resources and to trade upon which our own well-being depends.

Second, unquestionably we all wish for additional roads, schools, reclamation projects and other facilities here at home. But we will gain little and lose much if in our drive for them we recklessly tear down the very structure of the Free World which makes it possible for us to enjoy in peace and freedom the material blessings we now have.

Third, although the fundamental purpose of this program is to provide for the security of our Nation, our families and ourselves, it has added value of special significance now: Its effect is to counter economic recession. The greatest bulk of our mutual security funds—over three-fourths—are spent in the United States in the first instance. As one of the studies made for you last year showed, in 1955 some 600,000 jobs were provided by the program for American farmers and workers. The remainder, after aiding the economy of one of our allies, returns sooner or later, and mostly sooner, to be spent in the United States for the product of United States industries and agriculture. To cut these funds would be to cut employment here at home—as well as to endanger our security.

VI. DURATION OF PROGRAM

In conclusion let us consider a question often asked: "Will this program have to go on forever?" The answer, I suggest, is this:

I hope and believe that the concept of collective security is here to stay. Every civilized community applies that concept domestically. No longer does each family stand as the sole protector of their own home. There is a common contribution to a collective police force, fire department, sanitary department and the like. Only the society of nations has been so backward and primitive as to go on practicing the obsolete security conception of each nation standing alone. And the result has been a harvest of recurring wars.

We had hoped that the United Nations would provide the needed collective security on a universal basis. In time it may do so. But the Soviets with their veto power now block that. And Chairman Bulganin recently told President Eisenhower that the Soviet Union would not yield an inch on the matter of veto power.

But the practice of collective security must and will go on. Otherwise wars are inevitable and freedom is in constant jeopardy.

But even though the concept of collective security is permanent, that does not mean that the sums spent on security, be it national or collective, have to be permanently at the present level.

We are striving to achieve a limitation of armaments and to find solutions for the basic political problems that give rise to tensions. If the Communists will negotiate in good faith toward these ends, we believe that progress can be made which will make it safe to spend far less on armaments than is now the case.

As far as economic cooperation is concerned, we can expect that, as political stability increases, private capital will play a steadily increasing role. Private capital from the more industrialized countries has in the past flowed in substantial quantities to the less developed areas and can be expected to do so again.

VII. CONCLUSION

We are living today in an historic era of great change.

1. There is the march toward independence of colonial peoples. Since World War II, 20 nations with a population of about 750 million people have achieved their independence. These people, as well as the people of other less-developed nations, are determined that they must and will have economic progress.

2. There has been the revolutionary, and reactionary, threat of international communism. It has within little more than a generation subjected all or major parts of 17 nations and nearly one billion people to a new type of dictatorship, the dictatorship of a harsh materialistic creed. The outward thrust of that movement has been somewhat stayed. But the Communist dictators, exploiting the vast human and material resources they control, still seek to extend their conquests around the globe.

3. Within the Sino-Soviet world there are growing, and in the long run irresistible, demands which are incompatible with the creed and practice of orthodox communism. The subject nations increasingly demand more national independence; and a steadily increasing number of individuals seek greater personal security, increased freedom of choice, and more independence of thought. This mounting tide has already altered somewhat the complexion of Communist rule in Soviet Russia, and it has openly challenged that rule in such captive countries as Hungary, Poland, and East Germany.

4. To these three forces must be added a fourth—the force of the enlightened conduct and example of the United States.

We must cooperate with the healthy evolution toward independence of colonial peoples and assist in the achievement of economic progress and of freedom that will be sustained;

We must continue to hold in check the still aggressive and predatory ambitions of international communism; and

We must encourage by peaceful means the adaptation of Sino-Soviet government to the aspirations of the people. The rate of such adaptation will largely depend on whether the present type of rule gains, or is denied, enhanced prestige through external conquests.

Without the policies represented by the mutual security program and without adequate funds to carry out these policies, we cannot do these things. World trends hostile or unfavorable to us would gain the supremacy. There could be a new and prolonged "dark age."

This mutual security program is our response to a challenge which threatens our survival as a nation and the survival in the world of the ideals for which our Nation was founded. It is, therefore, a program which cannot be allowed to fail.

---

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by direction of the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, I submit an interim report (S. Rept. No. 1417).

The section I shall submit today contains the following parts: Foreword; Introduction; Findings, Nathan W. Shefferman and Labor Relations Associates of Chicago, Ill.; Findings, United Textile Workers of America; Findings, Bakers and Confectionery Workers International Union of America; Findings, International Union of Operating Engineers; and Legislative Recommendations.

Mr. President, the report, including this section, has been approved by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from

Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the chairman.

Dissenting views on this section will be filed today by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

The remaining portions of the report, including the factual sections on Nathan W. Shefferman, the bakers union, and the textile workers and operating engineers, will be released tomorrow. This second section will also include the factual parts on the hearings and the findings on the Tennessee area; Scranton, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; New York; Frank Brewster; Dave Beck; James R. Hoffa; and a general finding on the teamsters union.

Mr. President, the first section of the report, which I am submitting today, contains approximately 12,000 words; the second section, which I shall submit tomorrow, contains over 180,000 words.

The Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field thus presents its report on its first year's work and findings.

The committee was established under Senate Resolution 74 of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, by which the committee was authorized and directed "to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal and other improper practices or activities are or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities."

Testimony heard by the committee directly involved five unions: the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America; the Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union of America; the United Textile Workers of America; the International Union of Operating Engineers; and the Allied Industrial Workers of America—formerly the United Automobile Workers, AFL. A number of other unions, including the building-trades unions and the barbers unions, were also touched on.

Testimony heard by the committee also concerned Management Consultants Nathan W. Shefferman, Vincent J. Squillante, and Marshall Miller; Anheuser-Busch, Inc.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; the Whirlpool Corp.; the Continental Baking Co.; the Fruehauf Trailer Co.; the Mennen Co.; Associated Transport, Inc.; Montgomery Ward & Co.; the S. A. Healy Construction Co.; and a number of other employers, including several in New York who sought and obtained "sweetheart" contracts, so that they could keep depressed the wages and working conditions of thousands of Negro and Puerto Rican workers.

As an overall finding from the testimony produced at our hearings, the committee has uncovered the shocking fact that union funds in excess of $10 million were either stolen, embezzled, or misused by union officials over a period of 15 years, for their own financial gain or for the gain of their friends and associates.

As a background to the committee's work, the following statistics and information are of interest: During the 12 months of the committee's work it has held 104 days of public hearings and has heard the testimony of 486 witnesses. The record of these hearings is spread across 17,485 pages of original transcript. A total of some 16,000 persons were interviewed—a ratio of some 35 interviews for every witness who physically appeared before the committee. In addition, each witness who took the stand had been interviewed for an average of 5 hours for every hour of testimony.

A total of 2,740 subpenas were issued by the committee for individuals, bank records, union records, and other information for the hearings.

The committee wishes to express its gratitude to the General Services Administration and to the United States General Accounting Office for their cooperation during the past year. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell has been particularly helpful to the committee in assigning the staff members necessary for the conduct of its investigations.

During the year, the committee staff traveled some 650,000 miles and conducted interviews in 44 of the 48 States. Offices were opened and maintained by the committee during the year in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Miami, Seattle, Philadelphia, Nashville, Portland, Detroit, and St. Louis.

Some 100,000 letters have been received and analyzed in Washington. Seventy-five percent of them came from labor-union members, and a great many of them have been extremely helpful to the work of the committee.

In addition, much useful help came to the committee from newspapermen and their newspapers in various parts of the country.

Mr. President, at this time I shall not go further into detail, but I desire to call attention to the legislative recommendations the committee makes. They are usually in general terms, but they cover broadly the areas in which the committee has labored during the past year. They constitute the recommendations of the committee—namely, to have the Congress proceed immediately with legislation in the following fields:

First. Legislation to regulate and control pension, health, and welfare funds.

Second. Legislation to regulate and control union funds.

Third. Legislation to insure union democracy.

Fourth. Legislation to curb activities of middlemen in labor-management disputes.

Fifth. Legislation to clarify the no-man's land in labor-management relations.

Mr. President, I believe the report we are submitting fully substantiates the statement I now make; namely, that the testimony, facts, and other information now available to the Senate, under sworn testimony, as reflected by the report, are sufficient to justify and, in fact, to demand, in effect, that this Congress act with respect to legislation in these fields.

Mr. President, in the course of my brief remarks on the report, I have not pinpointed the various findings the committee has made. But the findings cover broader areas than those covered by the legislative recommendations of the committee. That arises from the fact that our legislative recommendations do not cover all of our findings, because we shall make further investigations in a number of these areas.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that if the committee can continue to function this year as effectively as it did last year, and if it is as successful in compiling a record in connection with its investigations this year, as it was as a result of its first year of operations, the committee will have done an outstanding job and will have presented to the Congress of the United States enough facts and information to enable it to legislate in practically every field of labor-management relations with respect to which legislation may be needed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I just wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is chairman of the select committee, that I think all Members of the Senate owe him and his committee and staff a debt of gratitude for the very fine work the committee has carried on to date. I hope it will pursue its work, not only in this session of Congress, but in future sessions. I am glad the committee has made at least some tentative recommendations at this time in regard to legislation.

Based on the record made by the committee to date, I think the American public expects the Congress of the United States to enact legislation in this session of Congress; and then, based on further hearings, it may be necessary to augment that legislation at future sessions. But, certainly along the lines of the general recommendations which the chairman of the select committee has referred to today, it seems to me there is a high degree of priority which the Congress of the United States should give to that proposed legislation for the protection of the rank and file of the union members of this country against some of the actions which some of their officials have pursued, and which have been amply demonstrated in the hearings before the Senator's committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader. I am hopeful, and I believe the committee is hopeful, the Congress will give some priority to these recommendations and undertake to enact legislation at this session.

Mr. President, I may say there is in the course of being drafted, and I expect to have it ready this week, and I expect later this week to introduce, a bill covering at least four of the general recommendations the committee has made. The bill will be somewhat comprehensive. The only legislative recommendation I have not undertaken to cover in the bill is somewhat technical, and I think it will

require some further evidence before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare before the recommended provision of the law can possibly be written. However, the proposed legislation I expect to introduce this week will cover at least four of the areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and an illustration, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

## ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, is so ordered.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that at the conclusion of action on H. R. 11086, which I am informed will take only a few minutes, we expect to have a quorum call and notify all Senators that the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the road bill reported from the Committee on Public Works. We hope to have the Senate convene early and stay late during the week until that bill shall be disposed of.

## WHEAT ACREAGE HISTORY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1416, H. R. 11086.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11086) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill would, first, prevent any farm from losing acreage history by reason of overplanting its allotment in 1958.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the bill was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and reported unanimously.

Second, passage of the bill would prevent any State, county, or farm from losing acreage history by reason of the overplanting of any farm allotment in 1959 or any subsequent year if the farm marketing excess is delivered to the Secretary or stored to avoid penalty.

Last year, in Public Law 203, 85th Congress, approved August 28, 1957, Congress provided that acreage planted in excess of acreage allotments would not count as history toward future allotments. By the time this information was conveyed to farmers many had already planted their wheat crops. By, in effect, changing the rules without adequate notice to these farmers, the law would either impose an excessive penalty upon them or compel them to plow up acreage already planted with resultant loss to them.

Furthermore, the law now permits farmers to plant in excess of their allotments and store the marketing excess without being subject to any marketing penalty. Many farmers do this in order to insure against future crop failures. In the event of such crop failures they would be able to market a certain amount of wheat stored from previous crops without penalty. Under the bill farmers could continue to follow this practice in 1959 and subsequent years without being subject to any acreage credit penalty. Any depletion of the wheat stored to avoid penalty which would result in the imposition of a marketing penalty would, however, also result in imposition of the acreage credit penalty.

Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who was the author of the original Senate bill, has a few remarks to make.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has pointed out the salient facts with regard to the bill. As the Senator indicated, when we passed Public Law 203 of the 85th Congress, by reason of the fact that the legislation was late in passage the Department did not get rules and regulations out in time for the farmers in many areas to know exactly what the compliance rules and regulations were. Hence, during that lag of time, in many States—and this was especially true in my State of Kansas—about one-half or two-thirds or three-fourths of the wheat in certain sections of the States was planted.

The legislation has been agreed upon by the Department, and by the Wheat Growers Association. The Senate bill is a companion bill to the one offered by Representative ALBERT, of Oklahoma, in the House of Representatives.

I think passage of the bill is important because of the seeding time and because of the harvesting time, which will come in soon in the Southern States and will move north. Unless the bill shall be passed, there will be a hardship worked on many farmers, because they will have to destroy some acreage they planted, not knowing what the full rules and regulations were.

I am heartily in favor of the measure. As stated by the chairman of the committee, the bill received the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill certainly should be passed. The bill represents simple justice, because the wheat farmers—particularly the winter wheatgrowers—planted their acreage last year, before the bill to freeze the wheat-acreage allotments was passed. It is important to have those allotments frozen, Mr. President, because the operations of the allotment program are resulting in the transferring from the natural wheat-growing States to other States of acres which should be devoted to wheat.

In my own State of South Dakota since 1955 we have suffered a gradual reduction in allotments from 2,822,000 acres to a prospective 2,718,000 acres for 1959, which is a loss of over 100,000 acres, under the national allotment of 55 million acres. The total national allotment has not been changed, but the operations of the present program are such that the wheat base is being transferred from the normal wheat-growing States to States which are not normally wheat-growing States.

I illustrate that point by referring to the fact that between 1958 and 1959 the State of Kansas, for example, will lose 55,000 acres; the State of Montana will lose 25,000 acres; the State of North Dakota will lose 50,000 acres; the State of South Dakota will lose 18,000 acres; and the State of Texas will lose 65,000 acres. These reductions will result under the operation of the law. The law which was passed last year will freeze those allotments, so that the transfer will not occur in succeeding years.

We need to make the law effective. We can make it effective fairly only by passing the bill which is now pending, H. R. 11086, or the companion measure, S. 3406.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table, which gives the history of the national base, the national allotment, the South Dakota base and the South Dakota allotment, from the year 1947 to the present.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Table showing wheat history of United States and of South Dakota*

| Crop year | United States total base (acres planted) | National allotment | South Dakota planted acres | South Dakota allotment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1959 | ---------- | 55,000,000 | ---------- | 2,718,000 |
| 1958 | ---------- | 55,000,000 | ---------- | 2,736,000 |
| 1957 | 84,800,000 | 55,000,000 | 4,133,000 | 2,747,000 |
| 1956 | 84,404,000 | 55,000,000 | 4,159,000 | 2,749,000 |
| 1955 | 82,620,000 | 55,000,000 | 3,951,000 | 2,822,000 |
| 1954 | 81,766,000 | 62,000,000 | 3,941,000 | 3,188,000 |
| 1953 | 78,144,000 | (1) | 3,868,000 | (2) |
| 1952 | 77,794,000 | (1) | 4,040,000 | (2) |
| 1951 | 78,239,000 | 72,785,000 | 4,018,000 | 3,709,000 |
| 1950 | 86,053,000 | 72,776,000 | 4,424,000 | 3,763,000 |
| 1949 | 82,596,000 | (1) | 4,284,000 | (2) |
| 1948 | 77,888,000 | (1) | 3,978,000 | (2) |
| 1947 | 78,344,000 | (1) | 3,899,000 | (2) |

[1] None required.
[2] None made.

To understand the table, bear in mind:

1. Allotments, nationally, must be made by the Secretary of Agriculture when the carryover or national supply exceeds by more than 50 percent the normal requirements and normal carryover for feed, seed, etc.

2. Keep in mind 1953 and 1952 as Korean war years when allotments were not mandatory.

3. The Marshall plan accounted for heavy exports in 1947, 1948, and 1949 and thereby reduced the carryover and thus eliminated the mandatory referral of allotments by the Secretary of Agriculture for those years.

NOTE.—The steady decline in acres allotted to South Dakota as other States established a history of acres planted (principally under

the 15-acre exemption) and thereby crept into the allotments made which meant that natural wheat States like South Dakota have been gradually losing allotment acres when the national allotment was forced to the 55 million national minimum by oversupply.

(This table compiled by United States Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota from USDA figures.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, dated March 21, 1958, which is a statement of the Department relative to the marketing quotas, proclaimed for the 1959 wheat crop, to which there is appended a list of the State acreage allotments by States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Marketing quotas proclaimed for 1959 wheat crop; referendum June 20:

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today took the following actions on 1959-crop wheat:

1. Proclaimed marketing quotas on the 1959 crop of wheat. This sixth successive proclamation of wheat marketing quotas is required by a wheat supply that is 57 percent above the marketing quota level.

2. Proclaimed a national wheat acreage allotment of 55 million acres, the minimum permitted by law.

3. Announced State shares of the national allotment (see table).

4. Set June 20, 1958, as the date for a referendum to determine producer approval or disapproval of quotas.

5. Announced a 38-State commercial and a 10-State noncommercial wheat producing area for 1959.

6. Announced that the minimum national average support price for 1959 production will be determined before the wheat referendum on the basis of the latest available supply information.

If marketing quotas are approved by growers, the national average support price available to eligible producers in the commercial area will be not less than the minimum support to be announced later. Individual farm marketing quotas will be the normal production or the actual production, whichever is larger, from the farm acreage allotment.

Growers in the commercial area who stay within their allotments will be eligible for price support on their entire production. Growers who exceed their farm acreage allotments will be subject to marketing quota penalties if (1) they have more than 15 acres of wheat for harvest or (2) they have not signed applications for exemption under the feed wheat provision permitting 30 acres or less to be used exclusively for feed on the farm. There are no limitations on the amount of wheat which may be grown for use on the farm for food, feed, or seed by State, religious, or charitable institutions.

Marketing quota penalties will be at 45 percent of the parity rate per bushel (parity as of May 1, 1959) on "excess" wheat production.

If marketing quotas are disapproved, there will be no restrictions on wheat marketings. Acreage allotments will remain in effect as a condition of eligibility for price support at the 50 percent of parity (as of July 1, 1959) rate required by law when quotas are disapproved.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The 1959 national wheat acreage allotment of 55 million acres is the minimum fixed by law and is the same as for the 1958 crop. Legislation provides for establishing a national wheat acreage allotment each year except in the event of a national emergency. If the allotment had been determined on the basis of the law's supply formula, the 1959 allotment would have been 21,375,000 acres.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine will be the sixth successive year that wheat acreage allotments have been in effect, and the fifth successive year that the 55-million-acre minimum allotment has been applicable.

MARKETING QUOTAS

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed by legislation to proclaim marketing quotas for the next wheat crop when the available supply is more than 20 percent above the normal supply. The estimated supply for the 1958–59 marketing year is actually 57.1 percent above the normal supply. This requires a marketing quota proclamation for the 1959–60 marketing year.

For marketing quota determination, the total supply is estimated at 2,017,000,000 bushels, consisting of a 1958 crop now estimated at 1,140,000,000 bushels, a carryover on July 1, 1958, estimated at 870 million bushels, and imports of 7 million bushels. The normal supply is 1,284,000,000 bushels, based on a normal domestic consumption of 620 million bushels during the 1957–58 marketing year and exports of 450 million bushels during the 1958–59 marketing year, with a 20-percent carryover allowance of 214 million bushels. The marketing quota level (120 percent of the normal supply) is 1,541,000,000 bushels. The estimated total supply of 2,017,000,000 bushels is 157.1 percent of the normal supply and requires a marketing quota proclamation for the 1959–60 wheat marketing year, the sixth successive year for which wheat marketing quotas have been proclaimed.

MARKETING QUOTA REFERENDUM

At least two-thirds of the producers voting in the referendum on June 20 must approve quotas for the 1959 crop if quotas are to remain in effect.

Growers who will have more than 15 acres of wheat for harvest as grain in 1959 in any one of the 38 commercial wheat States come under the regulation of quotas and will be eligible to vote in the referendum. Any producers who signed applications under the feed wheat provisions permitting them to grow wheat for use as feed on the farm for 1958 will not be eligible to vote in the referendum on quotas for the 1959 crop.

Referendum ballots may be cast at local polling places in the commercial wheat area. Location of polling places will be announced in the 38-State commercial area by county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) offices which will have charge of the referendum locally.

Marketing quotas have been approved by farmers for the last five wheat crops. In last year's referendum on quotas for the 1958 wheat crop, 86.2 percent of the farmers voting favored quotas (202,668 yes and 32,371 no). In the previous vote on 1957 quotas, the vote was 87.4 percent favorable (245,081 yes and 35,385 no). For 1956 quotas, the vote was 77.5 percent favorable (268,217 yes and 78,835 no).

STATE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The national wheat acreage allotment, 55 million acres (less 55,000 acres held as a national reserve), has been apportioned among all the States on the basis of acreage seeded for the production of wheat during the 10 years 1948–57, with adjustments for abnormal weather and for trends in planting. County allotments will be determined on essentially the same basis as the State allotments. The county allotments will be apportioned among individual farms according to past acreage of wheat, tillable acres, crop rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

Wheat producers will be informed of the acreage allotments for their farms in advance of the June 20 wheat quota referendum.

Wheat acreage allotments for the 38 States in the 1959 commercial wheat area with 1958 comparisons follow in this release.

COMMERCIAL AND NONCOMMERCIAL WHEAT AREAS

As authorized by legislation, 10 States having wheat allotments of 25,000 acres or less have been designated as noncommercial wheat States. Farm wheat allotments and marketing quotas do not apply in these States. The noncommercial area of 10 States for 1959 is 2 States smaller than in 1956, 1957, and 1958. Alabama and Mississippi have been added to the commercial producing area to make a 38-State total for 1959.

The 10 noncommercial wheat States and the allotments that—except for the 25,000-acre provision—would have been the basis for 1959 county and farm allotments in each State follow: Arizona, 23,708 acres; Connecticut, 567 acres; Florida, 3,961 acres; Louisiana, 14,367 acres; Maine, 1,458 acres; Massachusetts, 709 acres; Nevada, 12,378 acres; New Hampshire, 67 acres; Rhode Island, 503 acres; and Vermont, 527 acres.

The 38 States in the commercial area are listed in the table showing acreage allotments for each.

In the noncommercial States, price support will be at 75 percent of what the rate would be if the State were in the commercial area.

STATE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The following table shows by States the 1959 acreage allotments with 1958 comparisons:

[In acres]

| State | 1958 allotment | 1959 allotment |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | [1] 23,240 | 30,138 |
| Arkansas | 49,334 | 53,232 |
| California | 445,004 | 434,441 |
| Colorado | 2,704,917 | 2,695,718 |
| Delaware | 35,439 | 35,814 |
| Georgia | 107,591 | 110,513 |
| Idaho | 1,152,744 | 1,161,686 |
| Illinois | 1,386,663 | 1,422,658 |
| Indiana | 1,137,045 | 1,156,565 |
| Iowa | 138,175 | 153,900 |
| Kansas | 10,638,208 | 10,573,510 |
| Kentucky | 208,652 | 216,924 |
| Maryland | 185,390 | 185,359 |
| Michigan | 965,008 | 981,724 |
| Minnesota | 729,866 | 718,733 |
| Mississippi | [1] 16,256 | 29,440 |
| Missouri | 1,273,623 | 1,330,083 |
| Montana | 4,058,327 | 4,033,335 |
| Nebraska | 3,228,377 | 3,204,664 |
| New Jersey | 53,345 | 53,534 |
| New Mexico | 474,243 | 476,822 |
| New York | 315,570 | 322,145 |
| North Carolina | 282,796 | 296,356 |
| North Dakota | 7,309,992 | 7,259,722 |
| Ohio | 1,553,180 | 1,559,396 |
| Oklahoma | 4,859,635 | 4,874,312 |
| Oregon | 816,443 | 821,771 |
| Pennsylvania | 587,517 | 582,204 |
| South Carolina | 132,719 | 139,266 |
| South Dakota | 2,736,196 | 2,718,228 |
| Tennessee | 195,644 | 198,181 |
| Texas | 4,164,302 | 4,099,094 |
| Utah | 316,068 | 313,544 |
| Virginia | 259,436 | 259,999 |
| Washington | 2,014,392 | 2,002,740 |
| West Virginia | 40,393 | 39,874 |
| Wisconsin | 48,875 | 51,603 |
| Wyoming | 291,578 | 289,527 |
| Total, commercial area | 54,896,687 | 54,886,755 |
| Total, noncommercial area | 86,813 | 58,245 |
| National reserve | 16,500 | 55,000 |
| Total | 55,000,000 | 55,000,000 |

[1] Not in commercial area in 1958.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I approve of the pending legislation. It does not affect North Dakota directly, since North Dakota is one of the few States

which has not increased the wheat acreage in the past several years. This has been done in many other States and within the law. The law was changed last year to make it more difficult to overseed or to increase the wheat acreage, but that law did not pass Congress until the latter part of August, or until most of the winter wheat had been seeded.

The purpose of the pending legislation is to postpone the penalty provisions, since the law was passed after farmers had completed most of their seeding. As I stated, the legislation does not directly affect my State, but I believe it is necessary legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 11086) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 3406 is indefinitely postponed.

---

## FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1432, S. 3414, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in line with the agreement made by the leadership, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New York will yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator from New York will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SEC. 1. Federal-aid highways.

(a) (1) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $900 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; and the sum of $900 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The sums herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) Forty-five percent for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(B) Thirty percent for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(C) Twenty-five percent for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

(2) Apportionments: The sums authorized by this section shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

(b) Availability for expenditure: Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for construction, reconstruction, or improvements of specific projects as provided in this act and prior acts: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *And provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project. Any Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the same class of funds, primary, secondary, or urban, previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure.

SEC. 2. (a) Additional authorization of appropriation of Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban funds: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $400 million in addition to any sums heretofore authorized for such fiscal year. The sum herein authorized shall be apportioned: (A) 45 percent for projects on Federal-aid primary highway system, (B) 30 percent for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, (C) 25 percent for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas among the several States immediately upon enactment of this act in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

(b) The amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 2 (a) herein shall be available for expenditure pursuant to contracts awarded by the State highway departments prior to December 1, 1958, which shall provide for completion of construction prior to December 1, 1959. Any amounts apportioned to a State under provisions of this section remaining unexpended as above provided on December 1, 1958, shall lapse.

(c) The sums apportioned under this section shall be available for expenditure for projects on the primary or secondary Federal-aid systems, including extensions of these systems within urban areas, without limitation as to the percentage to be utilized on any system.

(d) The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 70 percent of the total cost thereof plus, in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, a percentage of the remaining 30 percent of such cost equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

(e) Authorization of appropriation for increasing Federal share: For the purpose of assisting any State in meeting the requirements for State funds to match any sums apportioned to such State under the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $115 million, which sum may be used by the Secretary of Commerce upon request of any State to increase the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That the amount of such increase of the Federal share shall not exceed two-thirds of the State's share of the cost of such project.

(f) Reimbursement: The total amount of such increases in the Federal share as are made pursuant to subsection (e) above, shall be reimbursed to the Federal Government by making deductions of sums equal to the amounts expended for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system, the Federal-aid secondary highway system and extensions of such systems in urban areas in two equal amounts from the amounts available to such State for expenditure on such highways under any apportionment of funds authorized to be appropriated therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1961 and June 30, 1962.

(g) Contract authority: Approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any project on account of which the Federal share is increased under the provisions of this section shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of such increase in the Federal share, and such

funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

(h) It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that the sum authorized under this section shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, any other sum heretofore or herein authorized for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems, including extensions of these systems within urban areas, and is made available for the purpose of immediate acceleration of the rate of highway construction on these systems beyond that being accomplished with funds otherwise authorized.

SEC. 3. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails.

(a) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $36 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $34 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided,* That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings may be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further,* That hereafter funds available for forest highways and forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and for sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *Provided further,* That the same percentage of the amounts authorized under this subsection for forest highways for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, shall be apportioned for expenditure in each State, Alaska, or Puerto Rico as was apportioned for expenditure in each State, Alaska, or Puerto Rico from funds authorized under this subsection for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958: *Provided further,* That the apportionment heretofore made by the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, is hereby approved: *And provided further,* That any State may transfer not to exceed the lesser of $500,000 or 5 percent of the amounts apportioned to such State under section 1 hereof to augment any apportionment made to such State for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of forest highways pursuant to this section; and when so transferred such sums may be expended in the same manner as funds authorized by this section for such purposes.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the appropriate officers of each State containing a national forest, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territory of Alaska, shall make a study to determine—

(1) The forest roads of primary importance to a State, county, or community which are within, adjoining, or adjacent to a national forest and have not been designated as forest highways;

(2) The amount necessary to complete construction of all forest highways;

(3) The amounts necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each of the 9 succeeding fiscal years to survey, construct, reconstruct, and maintain (A) forest highways, and (B) roads described in paragraph (1) of this subsection if such roads were forest highways; and

(4) The method by which the amounts determined pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection should be apportioned for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

The Secretary of Commerce shall report the results of such study to the President and the Congress on or before January 1, 1960.

SEC. 4. Roads and trails in national parks, etc.

(a) National parks, etc: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(b) Parkways: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $16 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(c) Indian reservations and lands: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided,* That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. Public lands highways.

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of $4 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

SEC. 6. Special provisions for Federal domain roads, etc.

Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract upon apportionment, or a date not earlier than 1 year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required: *Provided,* That any amount remaining unexpended 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations, and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated. Any funds heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized for any fiscal year for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums authorized for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years since and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, shall have been obligated. Any of such funds released by payment of final voucher or modification of project authorization shall be credited to the balance of unobligated authorizations and be immediately available for expenditure.

SEC. 7. (a) Authorization of appropriations for interstate system: Section 108 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the additional sum of $1,025,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

(b) Apportionments: Any portion of this additional sum herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, that has not been apportioned heretofore shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this act.

SEC. 8. Approval of estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System.

The estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, transmitted to the Congress on January 7, 1958, by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the provisions of section 108 (d) of the act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), and published as House Document No. 300, 85th Congress, second session, is hereby approved as the basis for making the apportionment of the funds authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960.

SEC. 9. Appointment of Federal-aid highway funds for fiscal years 1959 and 1960: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 209 (g) of the act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to apportion among the several States in the manner provided by law, all of the funds authorized for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960, for the Interstate System and the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems, including extensions thereof within urban areas.

SEC. 10. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "plus the United States pro rata part of the value of the materials which have been stockpiled in the vicinity of such construction or reconstruction in conformity to said plans and specifications."

SEC. 11. (a) Subsection (a) of section 111 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States: Whenever a State under State law is required to pay for all or

any part of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on any of the Federal-Aid Highway Systems, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project not to exceed 70 percent of such cost which the State is obligated to pay: *Provided,* That such reimbursement shall be made only after evidence satisfactory to him shall have been presented to the Secretary substantiating the fact that the State has paid such cost from its own funds."

(b) This section shall apply only with respect to Federal-aid highway projects covered by formal project agreements executed by the Secretary subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 12. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374) is amended by renumbering section 122 as section 123 and inserting a new section 122, as follows:

"SEC. 122. Areas adjacent to the Interstate System.

"(a) National policy: To promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways it is hereby declared to be in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and to improve areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to that system. It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for:

"(1) Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.

"(2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

"(3) Signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

"(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

"(b) Agreements: The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with State highway departments (including such supplementary agreements as may be necessary) to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section with respect to the Interstate System within the State. Any such agreement shall include provisions for regulation and control of the erection and maintenance of advertising signs, displays, and other advertising devices in conformity with the standards established in accordance with subsection (a) and may include, among other things, provisions for preservation of natural beauty, prevention of erosion, landscaping, reforestation, development of viewpoints for scenic attractions that are accessible to the public without charge, and the erection of markers, signs, or plaques, and development of areas in appreciation of sites of historical significance. Any such agreement may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the national policy, provide for excluding from application of the national standards segments of the Interstate System which traverse incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control, or which traverse other areas where the land use is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial, or which are built on rights-of-way wholly acquired before July 1, 1956.

"(c) Federal share: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), if an agreement pursuant to this section has been entered into with any State prior to July 1, 1961, the Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System within that State provided for by funds authorized under the provisions of section 108 of this act, to which the national policy and the agreement apply, shall be increased by one-half of 1 percent of the total cost thereof, not including any additional cost that may be incurred in the carrying out of the agreement: *Provided,* That the increase in the Federal share which is payable hereunder shall be paid only from appropriations from moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which such appropriations are hereby authorized.

"(d) Whenever any portion of the Interstate System is located upon or adjacent to any public lands or reservations of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce may make such arrangements and enter into such agreements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands or reservations as may be necessary to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and any such agency is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate fully with the Secretary of Commerce in this connection.

"(e) Whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise or regulate advertising in an area adjacent to the right-of-way of a project on the Interstate System for the purpose of implementing this section, the cost of such acquisition shall be considered as a part of the cost of construction of such project and Federal funds may be used to pay the Federal pro rata share of such cost: *Provided,* That reimbursement to the State shall be made only with respect to that portion of such cost which does not exceed 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way for such project."

SEC. 13. Relationship of this act to other acts: effective date.

All provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, together with all acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect and be applicable hereto. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of the act are hereby repealed. This act shall take effect on the date of enactment.

SEC. 14. Short title.

This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958."

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. GEORGE S. LONG, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1984. An act to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to stay temporarily any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments; and

H. R. 11085. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

## DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE S. LONG, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate resolutions coming over from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives, which were read, as follows:

House Resolution 508

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
*March 24, 1958.*

*Resolved,* That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable GEORGE S. LONG, a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

*Resolved,* That a committee of eight Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved,* That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, over the weekend the final chapter in an inspiring story of triumph over adversity was written in Washington when death claimed the Honorable GEORGE SHANNON LONG, Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana.

As he lived, GEORGE LONG died—serving the people of his State.

For all of his 74 years, GEORGE LONG waged a bitter battle with adversity—yet, this very battle made him a greater man—a man who knew the hard side of life, a man who knew the better side, and a man who could thus appreciate the problems of people.

He was born in a log cabin in Tunica, La., September 11, 1883. From this humble beginning, GEORGE LONG and his brothers and sisters reached a position as one of the best known and influential families in Louisiana.

Of the four Long brothers, all rose to prominence. The eldest was Julius Long, now a retired businessman in Shreveport, La. The youngest was Earl K. Long, today the Governor of Louisiana. Perhaps best known of all his brothers was Huey P. Long, late a United States Senator, and the father of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana.

GEORGE LONG was born at a time when a man made himself what he wanted to be. He and all his brothers decided that they wanted to improve themselves. And they did. It was the age-old story

of Americana—the poor country boy seeking his way in life and finding it.

Yet, as GEORGE LONG inched himself forward, he did so with a humility and genuine concern for all his fellow men that earned him friends, not only in his home State, but in other sections of the United States as well.

For example, during a rather lengthy stay in Oklahoma, in 1920, he was elected to the Oklahoma State Legislature, and served through 1922.

GEORGE LONG was a man of many talents. After attending the public schools in Winn Parish, La., he attended Mount LeBanon College, and later taught school in Winn Parish.

GEORGE LONG's next interest was dentistry, and he received a doctor of dental surgery degree in 1904. He was admitted to the bar in Oklahoma in 1923.

GEORGE LONG returned to Louisiana in 1936, after the death of his brother Huey Long, and made his home in Pineville, where he entered business.

He was elected to the Congress in 1952, and was serving his third term at the time of his death. He is survived by his wife, the former Jewell Tyson, of Pineville.

He was a lifelong member of the Baptist Church, and was a past president of the Pineville Chamber of Commerce. In addition, he was a 32d degree Mason, a Shriner, and a member of the Kiwanis Club of Pineville.

The life of GEORGE LONG—educator, dentist, lawyer, and legislator—is an inspiring reminder that poverty need not close the door to achievement—that hard work and an abiding desire to overcome adversity can bring a rich and rewarding life.

Those of us who knew GEORGE LONG and now miss him will remember him primarily as a man and as a friend, one who could and did pull himself up from his humble origin to a position whereby he could serve his friends and neighbors—a man who gave to the people of his State unstintingly in time and effort—a man who lived and proved the old axiom that God helps those who help themselves.

Louisiana will miss GEORGE LONG, Mr. President—and so will our country.

Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. GEORGE S. LONG, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 280) was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints, as the committee to attend the funeral of the late Representative, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

## GOP HIGH INTEREST RATES FOR THE REA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Tuesday, March 18, 1958, for the second time in 30 days, the Federal Reserve Board reduced the required reserves of its member banks, thereby releasing a potential $3 billion of new funds for lending.

A Board spokesman called this action an effort to create credit conditions still more favorable to recovery. In short, this was a move to end the administration's hard money, high interest rate policy, which is largely responsible for the serious unemployment and business recession gripping our Nation today. Surely, all of us can now see the folly and error of this high interest rate policy, which has resulted in more than five million men and women without work and the highest cost of living in our history.

But, despite the critical evidence of how the high interest policy has hurt our economy, this administration seems intent on raising interest rates on REA loans. It is clear that higher REA interest rates could only mean higher rates for electric and telephone service to the farmers and rural communities.

Mr. President, in view of this recession—in view of the fact that REA co-op loans have made money for the taxpayers, not lost it—I now strongly urge that President Eisenhower withdraw his announced proposals to raise REA interest rates. Determination of this administration to raise REA interest rates is like a stubborn motorist who takes the wrong turn and finds himself going in the wrong direction on a one-way street, yet he is too bullheaded to admit he is driving in the wrong direction. There are plenty of places where there is room for, and need for some strong determination in this administration, but this mania to raise REA interest rates is not one of those places. The so-called revolving fund plan is a plan to render the REA into the hands of the private moneylenders. It is an effort to Bensonize the Rural Electric Cooperatives and leave them captives chained to a financial plan that would spell their doom. The present REA financing plan has worked and should be retained unchanged.

Mr. President, I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

## TAX CUT NEEDED TO CURE RECESSION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 10 days ago my amendment to give a tax cut to all Americans was temporarily lost. I said then, and I still say, that a Federal income-tax reduction in the form of raising income-tax exemption from $600 to $800, would boost business to the extent of $3 billion within a few months.

I would like to respectfully remind Members on both sides of the aisle that had we voted through the tax reduction to all Americans, it could have become effective on April 1, and we would have been that big step nearer toward cutting unemployment and ending recession. But it was the position of the administration that this is not the time for a tax cut; that we should wait and see.

With more than 5 million men and women out of work and the number still climbing, I should like to know what we are waiting for? With small-business bankruptcies at an alltime high, I ask again, what are we waiting for? I submit that we have waited long enough, or too long. To sustain my point, let me refer you, Mr. President, to a front-page story in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, headed "Government Economists Now See No Upturn Before Late in Year." The lead of this excellent story, by Joseph R. Slevin, reads as follows:

> Government economists are coming to the conclusion that business activity will begin to turn up slowly in the fourth quarter and not before. Some of the gloomier seers think the rise may not begin until the first quarter of next year. And all of the forecasters qualify their predictions by saying that all bets are off if there is no tax cut.

Mr. President, the Senate will have the opportunity again soon to pass the tax reduction for all Americans that I am urging. I urge that when this matter comes up again, that we have immediate favorable action toward ending this recession. I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post story I referred to earlier be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT ECONOMISTS NOW SEE NO UPTURN BEFORE LATE IN YEAR

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Government economists are coming to the conclusion that business activity will begin to turn up slowly in the fourth quarter and not before. Some of the gloomier seers think the rise may not begin until the first quarter of next year. And all the forecasters qualify their predictions by saying that all bets are off if there is no tax cut.

The recession now has gone further and is expected to last longer than any of the top economists anticipated just a few months ago.

The big, unforeseen trouble has been a sharp drop in automobile sales. Government economists expected the automobile manufacturers to have a good year and they are having a dismal one.

The forecasts of a fourth quarter rise turn partly upon expectations of an improvement in automobile activity when the 1959 models appear in dealer showrooms. If consumers cold-shoulder Detroit for the rest of this year, the economists says prospects of an upturn are very dim indeed.

The trouble that the experts have when they look for a turning point is that no one seems to be able to find a set of buying demands that will be strong enough to kick off a vigorous upsurge. That's why they

all look for a slow rise when the advance begins.

State and local government spending for schools, hospitals, roads, and other facilities is expected to continue to climb slowly. So is Federal spending. And so, with any luck, is home building. Consumer spending, which has been tapering off, will pick up moderately if the 1959 models are attractive. But the downturn in business purchases of new plant and equipment that caused the slump is expected to continue—or, at best, to flatten out.

There's no spark in sight—no homebuilding boom as in 1954, no automobile buying jag as in 1955, no capital goods spending spree as in 1956 and 1957.

Guesses as to how long it will take to lift economic activity back to where it was at the end of 1957 range up to a year from the time the upturn begins. That could mean late 1959 or early 1960.

The most disheartening feature of the current situation has been the absence of substantial price cuts. Price reductions customarily are a key part of a recession adjustment and the economists figure that there's nothing that would whet business and consumer appetites more than a round of price slashes.

But prices have been holding firm. There's now a worrisome suspicion among the experts that this will be remembered as the recession that was ended by Government tax cuts and other moves—as the recession that was marked by about as many price maladjustments at the end as there had been at the beginning.

If the forebodings of the experts prove correct, it's a safe bet that the fourth postwar recession will follow closely on the heels of the current dip.

## FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement on the detrimental effect on all our economy of the unlimited flood of foreign oil which is pouring into the country.

In the interest of time, I ask unanimous consent to have my statement and the following newspaper articles and other material printed in the RECORD:

A foreign crude oil import resolution introduced by Jimmy Givens, Galveston County Democratic Chairman, and passed by the Galveston County Democratic Executive Committee.

The story from the March 21, 1958, Dallas Morning News headed "Oil Producing Days Cut to Record Eight."

The story from the Abilene Reporter News of March 19, 1958, headed "Witnesses Cite Damaging Effects of High Imports."

A statement from John R. Stockton, director of the Bureau of Business Research of the University of Texas.

Dr. Stockton is one of the outstanding economists in the Nation and his statement is entitled to the careful consideration of every American.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

I respectfully inquire if there is any Member of this Senate, or this administration, or the President himself, who has the slightest idea whether or when corrective action will be taken to stop the flood of foreign oil? I, for one, call for an end to these terrapin tactics. And, 200,000 Texans without jobs, and hundreds of businessmen near bankruptcy in the Southwest have had more than enough of this administration's refusal to curb the oil cartel.

I will admit that several times lately, after reading all these glowing news reports that the President was about to move, I thought we were ready to tee off on this problem. But it's always been a false alarm. Somebody keeps shouting "fore," but no one drives the ball down the green. This oil imports problem is complex but I believe the unemployed of the oil-producing States of the Nation have concluded it's time to quit puttering around.

As a direct result of administration refusal to act to curb this flood of cheap foreign oil, production in my State has been cut to an alltime low allowable of 8 days in April. This means another reduction of $4 million daily income—a cutback that will injure thousands of workers and property owners.

I again urge the administration to exercise its authority and cut down the excessive importation of cheap foreign oil.

FOREIGN CRUDE OIL IMPORT RESOLUTION

Resolution introduced by Chairman J. D. Givens and passed by unanimous vote in regular meeting of the Galveston County Democratic Executive Committee on February 25, 1958:

"Whereas the import of foreign oil into the United States has seriously affected the Texas independent oil producers and manufacturers; and

"Whereas these imports have affected the employment of workers in the oil and allied industries; and in turn will seriously affect the economy of our local communities; and

"Whereas these imports have caused a cutback in the oil production in the State of Texas which brings about a loss of revenue to the State of countless thousands of dollars; and

"Whereas the proposal by President Eisenhower for voluntary curbs on imports is impractical and ineffective and has not produced any desired results: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Galveston County Democratic Executive Committee urge the United States Senators and all the United States Congressmen from Texas to take immediate steps to curb the imports of foreign oils or to impose an import tax so that the Texas crude producers can fairly and justly compete with the foreign imports."

[From the Dallas Morning News of March 21, 1958]

OIL PRODUCING DAYS CUT TO RECORD EIGHT

(By Richard M. Morehead, Austin Bureau of the News)

AUSTIN, TEX.—The railroad commission Thursday cut Texas' oil wells to a record low 8-day producing schedule for April—but there were predictions of better times ahead.

"It looks like the worst part of the business recession is over," President W. K. Whiteford of Gulf Oil Corp., testified.

The commission's monthly proration hearing in the Stephen F. Austin Hotel drew the largest crowd—about 400—in many years.

It marked the interest of producers and purchasers alike in seeking to solve the problem of oversupply. Some predicted that the worst will be over in April, and that Texas production can be increased.

A surprise witness, President R. R. Dawson of the Humble Refinery Workers' Union at Baytown, urged the commission to increase production now—to meet the competition from foreign crude on a price basis.

"We must tighten our belts and fight for our industry in Texas," said Dawson. "If the prices were to fall slightly so that we could compete with foreign crude, and our production increase sharply as our oil found more buyers in the market place, would this be a castastrophe?"

Nobody answered Dawson directly, but Dallas independent producer Jake L. Hamon had testified that failure to reduce the nation's excessive petroleum stocks would be "tragic."

"We ought to meet this problem head on," said Hamon, who recommended an 8-day schedule on behalf of more than 100 Dallas oilmen.

M. G. Hansbro, a Houston independent, had a more drastic suggestion.

"Shut all Texas fields down until the surplus is consumed," he recommended.

Permissible production in April will be 2,444,571 barrels daily, 120,203 barrels below last week's average. It will drop the State's quota 1,400,000 barrels below the March 1957 level.

This means a reduction of more than $4 million daily income for Texas oil producers and royalty owners. Tax revenues to the State alone will be nearly $200,000 daily below the year-ago rate.

The slowdown in tax income will add to the legislature's woes next year. Comptroller R. S. Calvert already had estimated at least $120 million must be raised to maintain present State services in the face of shrinking oil output.

While Gulf's President Whiteford expressed optimism that the worst of the business recession is over, nobody forecast much immediate benefit to the domestic oil producer.

M. E. Speaght, executive vice president of Shell Oil Co., estimated United States consumption this year will be 3.6 percent ahead of last year's disappointing performance.

Another two dozen big-company spokesmen estimated smaller gains—or none at all.

Morgan J. Davis, president of Humble Oil & Refining Co., Texas' biggest producer and purchasing company, said domestic producers must reduce unit costs on oil to compete with the foreign product.

Davis recommended drilling fewer nonexploratory wells and curbing other capital expenditures. The Humble spokesman said the Nation could reduce its annual drilling program to 40,000 or 50,000 wells without harm—instead of the 59,000 drilled last year.

The Nation's developed oil-producing capacity of nearly 10 million barrels daily provides a large margin of safety for emergency, Davis added. Present production is below 6,500,000 barrels.

But Davis said the most pressing need now is for immediate and effective action to reduce imports of crude oil substantially and to control imports of products.

Dallas producer Hamon viewed as a hopeful sign President Eisenhower's indication to United States Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON that there will be definite action toward the import problem.

Commissioner Ernest O. Thompson drew from Gulf's President Whiteford a statement that further reduction in imports "would be helpful" but he declined to go along with the Texas suggested 20-percent mandatory cut. Gulf is a major importer.

George W. Goad, representing Tidewater Oil Co., was quizzed by Thompson concerning its failure to observe the voluntary import quota assigned by Federal administrators. Thompson cited this as evidence that voluntary action will not work.

Three other Dallas producers spoke for the 8-day schedule. They were M. G. Langhorn, representing Hunt Oil Co.; Frank Pitts, Starr Oil Co., and Frank Douglas, the G. H. Vaughn interests.

J. L. Latimer, of Dallas, president of Magnolia Petroleum Co., predicted oil consumption this year will be 1.5 to 2 percent greater than last year. His company recommended a 9-day producing schedule for April, but said 8 days would be satisfactory.

[From the Abilene Reporter-News of March 19, 1958]

WRECKING TAX STRUCTURE—WITNESSES CITE DAMAGING EFFECTS OF HIGH IMPORTS

Witnesses from Abilene and other sections of Texas Tuesday told the Governors Imports

Study Commission that excessive imports were shutting down the petroleum industry, wrecking the State's tax structure, and endangering the oil conservation program.

Olin Culberson, chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas, declared that imports now have "first call on the domestic market."

"States find themselves increasingly in the role of filling oil requirements on a supplemental basis," Culberson said.

He hinted that the Railroad Commission may take steps to cut down on purchaser proration if it continues.

Referring to "discriminatory practices" of some purchasing companies, he said he believes the commission soon may test what he termed "additional powers given it to set forth stringent requirements for the purchasing and transporting of oil."

"Nothing we can do in Texas, however, will bring a balance if imports continue at the present level," Culberson said. He added that there is a danger of "further conquest of State powers by Federal authorities" if mandatory controls are ordered.

"But imports must be restrained if we are to have a healthy oil industry in our State," he declared.

ABILENE AREA HARD HIT

James S. Lauderdale, president of the West Central Texas Oil and Gas Association, said the Abilene area is harder hit than any other section of the Nation so far as purchaser proration is concerned.

"We lead the Nation in unconnected wells, trucked oil, o'l without a market, and purchaser proration," he said.

Drilling activity in west-central Texas has been reduced by nearly 40 percent as compared to a year ago, Lauderdale said.

"One service company that services 55 percent of the drilling rigs in the area has suffered a 60 percent dollar volume decrease from 1955."

Cheap foreign oil "is about to eliminate many of us who for years have been proud to say, 'I am an oilman,' " Lauderdale concluded

C. T. McLaughlin, of Snyder, president of the Sharon Ridge Producers & Royalty Owners Association, said the field his group is interested in was hit earlier and harder than most.

That area of north Mitchell and south Scurry Counties has about 1,636 wells, with independent producers operating 95 percent of them.

McLaughlin said only about one-half of the State allowable is being taken from the field, and drilling rigs digging development wells have dwindled from 20 in normal times to only one this week.

Dr. Frank B. Conselman, widely known consulting geologist with headquarters in Abilene, refuted the idea that the United States is running out of oil.

NO EXPLORATION

"We are fully aware that we must keep on drilling if we are to maintain our reserves," Conselman said. "But unfortunately no exploration drilling program can be maintained in west Texas, or anywhere else in the State, in the face of the adverse conditions that now exist, due primarily to imports."

He said the decline comes at a time when progress was being made in looking for more difficult oil prospects, namely stratigraphic traps.

"Here in west central Texas, patterns are beginning to emerge, and trends are starting to take shape," he said. "Our finding average should pick up, if we can get a chance to prove it."

James H. Daniel, chairman of the Abilene Chamber of Commerce Oil and Gas Committee, was accompanied by three men representing grassroots phases of the petroleum industry. They were Grady Roberts, partner in Triangle Supply Co.; Melvin Dixon, owner of Dixon Drilling Co.; and Paul Graham, operator of a trucking firm.

All three, in answer to questions, said their businesses are dwindling, and that they could not continue to operate if the current 9-day allowable remains in effect indefinitely.

Berry Brown, Wichita Falls tax consultant, told the commission that imports, price cuts, and pipeline proration will have an adverse effect on ad valorem taxes in 1958.

"Oil in the ground now is worth from 20 to 30 percent less," Brown said.

OIL VALUE DROPS

It will be necessary for schools, counties, and the State to revise all assessment percentages if current rate of spending continues.

"I think oil has lost value it's not going to get back," Brown declared. "We'd better pack our wagons for a long haul."

Senator David Ratliff, of Stamford, said the State must start economizing or levy new taxes.

"The costs of running the State are on the increase, and we will have a deficit even at the current rate of spending," Ratliff said.

Representative Truet Latimer, of Abilene, said he didn't believe the recession in west central Texas is part of the general recession sweeping across the United States, "but is due to excessive oil imports."

He pointed out that the current estimate of anticipated income for the State was based on a 15-day production pattern, and nothing could be done until the next session of the legislature.

"It is my personal opinion that if the Texas Legislature met each year, your State government would not be in its present embarrassing position of issuing hot checks."

Representative J. Gordon Bristow, of Big Spring, gave extemporaneous testimony that was short and to the point.

Commenting on imports, he said: "Gentlemen, we're foundered. We don't need any more of that stuff."

R. W. (Stormy) Thompson, of Big Spring, vice president of Cosden Petroleum Corp., said he favored a tariff system of imports control rather than a quota system.

"Refineries would lose their enthusiasm for foreign crude if the duty were raised so as to equalized prices," Thompson said.

Thompson said Cosden was forced to shut down its Hawley refinery mainly because of a cut in purchasing of aviation gasoline by the Air Force.

PIPELINE PRORATION

"For 2 or 3 years we have had to apply pipeline proration in the areas we buy crude because we don't need all the wells can produce," Thompson said. "We always have given new wells a share of our market, however."

Thompson said crude prices are now determined by the east coast refineries where cheap foreign oil is available.

Fred Husbands, executive vice president of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, said that a recent survey by his organization showed employment down 17 percent in 19 oil-producing counties.

"In two of the most active and largest areas within our region, we find that the reduction in number of active drilling rigs is 34 percent," Husbands said.

John Culwell, superintendent of public schools in Big Spring, said imports are causing a decrease in revenue for every school in the State.

"Directly and indirectly oil affects every schools' financial standing," he said.

R. L. Barry, with the Handley Co. in Dallas, appeared at his own request to urge that a higher tariff on imports be sought rather than mandatory controls. He said he did not want to see the oil business regulated as is the farm business, so that "we'd have to get permission from Washington to drill on the north 40."

J. Harold Dunn, president of Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp., in Amarillo, also appeared as an impromptu witness.

He said his company was forced to institute pipeline proration at times during the last 2 years because of inability to sell its surplus crude.

---

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN R. STOCKTON

(Statement by John R. Stockton, director of the bureau of business research of the University of Texas and a member of the governor's oil import study commission. This statement draws some tentative conclusions from the testimony before the governor's oil import study commission at its hearing in Austin on February 25 and 26, 1958.)

The testimony before the governor's oil import study commission in Austin on February 25 and 26 established the salient facts about the oil import situation and its effect on Texas and delineated rather clearly the alternative courses that are open to the United States. It will be the role of future hearings to fill in factual data on specific aspects of the larger problem, but the main issues were drawn in an unmistakenly clear manner.

The effects of the reduction in the Texas allowable are readily available for everyone to see. The reduction in the production of crude oil has slowed down exploration with a resulting decrease in income to everyone working in this industry or selling materials and services to it. The employment statistics for the crude production industry have not yet registered the effect of the reduced production, partly because there is a lag in reducing the labor force and partly because it is not feasible to cut the number of employees proportionately to the reduction in production. Reduced income to royalty owners and reduced taxes to the State treasury will, on the other hand, be felt immediately upon the cut in production. Extensive testimony was introduced to establish the importance of the taxpayments of the oil-producing industry to the income of the State government and the dependence of the various programs on this income.

The present situation, which was almost unanimously considered a crisis, has become particularly acute because the increase in crude oil imports has come at a time when the domestic economy was in a period of rather distinct recession, although this decline is considered to be a minor one that will probably reverse its direction within the next year.

With the reopening of the Suez Canal the world capacity to supply petroleum to the major consuming areas became much greater than demand at the present time. The United States demonstrated that it could not only supply all of its own needs but could make a substantial amount of oil available to European markets. To the extent that the market in the United States is supplied by foreign crude, the production in this country must be cut.

It was clearly demonstrated by the evidence submitted to the commission that this present situation is not one that will correct itself in time. Approximately two-thirds of the reserves of the Free World are in the Middle East. These reserves are nearly five times the reserves of the United States. In addition production costs are lower than in this country.

If the forces of economic law are allowed to divide the market for petroleum, foreign production would inevitably capture a major portion of the United States market. It was clear from the evidence submitted that this is a long-range problem and a policy must be established by the United States without delay. Under present costs, most of the oil produced in the United States cannot compete in price with the oil from the Middle East. If this oil is permitted to compete

freely in the United States market, it will mean the abandonment of our secondary reserves. This premise was established in the testimony of Dr. Paul D. Torrey, petroleum engineer and geologist. This testimony was in many ways the most dramatic of the facts presented in the 2-day hearing and left little doubt that the choice being faced by the people of the United States is between shifting to a reliance on foreign sources of oil or curtailing imports of oil and continuing to depend to a major degree on the secondary reserves of this country. The older wells in the secondary reserves cannot compete on a cost basis with the oil from such areas as the Middle East, but in the aggregate they represent a very large amount of oil. Dr. Torrey stated that they are precious resources and should under no circumstances be permitted to be lost.

The testimony emphasized that it is not valid to argue that we should use foreign oil now and save the secondary reserves for later use, since it is virtually impossible to retain the secondary reserves without continuing production from them. The choice apparently is clearly one of maintaining the oil industry by restricting imports or shifting to a substantial reliance on these foreign sources.

Classical free-trade theory maintains that a country should produce the goods in which it has the greatest relative advantage and should trade with other areas for those goods in which it has a lesser relative advantage. This theory has, in general, worked well only where the area covered was under the control of one government. The domestic market in the United States is an outstanding example of a situation where a region tends to acquire industries in which it has a relative advantage.

But what happens when this reasoning is applied to a world situation? It seems unthinkable that in the present state of international relations the United States would voluntarily permit a vital resource, such as petroleum, to be virtually destroyed and reliance be placed on imported oil. Probably no one in this country would advocate such a policy, but permitting excessive imports of oil is essentially the same thing. Even if the use of foreign oil resulted in lower prices to the consumer—and there is no evidence that this has been the case—there is no assurance that these lower prices would continue after the domestic industry had been closed down.

It is assumed that nuclear or solar energy will supply a growing proportion of the increased needs for energy and that eventually the United States will need to import oil to supplement energy from domestic sources. All of the testimony received by the commission, however, indicates that the importation of foreign oil at the present time is damaging the economy of the oil-producing States and is in no way helping the economy of other parts of the country.

## THE RECESSION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very excellent article written by Mr. George Shea, of the Wall Street Journal, with respect to the existing recession.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 24, 1958]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

Reliance on the power of the Federal Government to reverse the recession seems to be so strong in the minds of at least some portions of the general public that the topic is worth dealing with again. Basically, furthermore, the belief in the Government's magic seems to center around its ability to spend more than it takes in—whether through public works, tax cuts, or other red-ink devices—and this fact gives us a relatively simple approach to the topic.

The ability to spend more than one's income has never been regarded as a skill difficult to learn. Nor has it, through most of history, possessed much respectability. Politicians, of course, thousands of years ago discovered its virtues for staying in office, as witness the Roman Emperors with their circuses. But the 20th century, with its special reverence for science, was the first to develop the pseudoscientific theory that governmental red ink means good business.

Even at that, popular as such a notion was bound to be among many people, it somehow gained little credence until the recent boom, which saw inflation and good business accompany each other. Now, as a result in part of that experience, the theory has acquired increased numbers of adherents. Yet a look at a few facts will quickly show how poorly based it is.

One of the best arguments against the theory is that it just didn't work at all in the 1930's, either under Hoover or Roosevelt. The Federal deficits in those years were very large by the standards of those days and big even by today's lights. Yet unemployment persisted at high levels throughout the period, with unemployment totals higher than now, although the labor force was smaller by 20 million persons, being around 50 million against 70 million today. Here are the figures, starting with 1932:

[In millions]

| | Fiscal year Federal deficits | Calendar year average unemployment |
|---|---|---|
| 1932 | $2,735 | 12.1 |
| 1933 | 2,602 | 12.8 |
| 1934 | 3,630 | 11.3 |
| 1935 | 2,791 | 10.6 |
| 1936 | 4,425 | 9.0 |
| 1937 | 2,777 | 7.7 |
| 1938 | 1,177 | 10.4 |
| 1939 | 3,862 | 9.5 |
| 1940 | 3,918 | 8.1 |

Another fact that tends to put the burden of proof on those who want to believe the theory is that the continued price inflation of the last 2 years has not prevented the Nation from slipping into recession. Of course, the causes of the latest general price rise are mixed, but it suffices here to mention that they couldn't have been financed without money, so it doesn't seem to be lack of money that has caused the recession.

That matter of money lies at the heart of this problem. The theory that Federal red ink makes good business is based on the idea that such red ink spreads money around, and that this money will be used right away to buy goods or services, thus ending the recession. It is true that Federal red ink is basically nothing but a special way of printing additional currency, and that in the long run floods of paper money will cheapen its value and raise prices expressed in paper units.

The problem is that, in any well established economic system, passing out the money to the people who will immediately spend it is very difficult. A good example of the difficulty is that a tax cut won't help the unemployed, though they are the very people whose income is in need of bolstering. There are no special funnels which will put red ink in just the right places. The system just isn't organized that way. It's organized to pay for value received in terms of goods or services which are wanted and purchased, and a Government deficit can't quickly change in any radical way a distribution of incomes which is organized in that fashion.

Much the same sort of problem arises in any Federal effort to fight recession. The housing bill just passed by Congress isn't given by builders much chance to stimulate construction appreciably, as a story in this paper a couple of days ago made clear. A few potential buyers who have been teetering on the edge might be induced to act when the easier terms are available, but mostly those who will take advantage of the new terms are people who were planning to buy anyhow.

Public works cannot be counted on always to add to the total amount of work done in the Nation. For instance, to what extent will a new Federal highway bypass permit a town to cut down its own road work?

Shifting the burden of taxes is another course frequently advocated as a stimulant. According to this theory, the well-to-do must be made to pay more taxes and the poor less. Perhaps by this method a few buyers might be added for shirts or even toasters, but likewise some investors in houses or in productive equipment might be subtracted. In addition, here the same problem arises as with a general tax cut, that of helping those with no jobs. It is far easier to slash substantial incomes by taxation than to use it to improve small incomes.

Finally, there is the idea of raising wages by passing new minimum wage laws or using the power of Government to help enforce higher wage demands. Yet rising wages have been of no help lately. Hourly rates have been going up steadily for years, and kept on rising last year. If that didn't prevent the recession from getting under way, what makes anyone think it would reverse the downtrend?

Government actions and policies, including the so-called built-in stabilizers, such as jobless pay, can soften the blow of a business downturn, but probably it still has to run its course. Such measures resemble the action of various drugs in fighting an illness. Their proper use keeps the patient from getting as sick as he otherwise might. But he still has to stay in bed and convalesce, as was the case in the days before antibiotics and new theories about Government deficits.

## HALL OF FAME FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, some time ago I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, which, if approved by the Congress, would endorse the establishment of a Hall of Fame for Agriculture.

Since the submission of the resolution, I have received much mail and many editorials commenting on it.

I am calling to the attention of the Senate an editorial written by Mr. A. Q. Miller, of the Belleville Telescope, Belleville, Kans., urging that special consideration be given to the name of a former Member of this body, the late Arthur Capper.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPPER HALL OF FAME

Congressman FRANK CARLSON introduced a resolution in the Senate last week calling for the establishment of a Hall of Fame to Agriculture because of the important role it has played in the development of our Nation. What is more, CARLSON proposed it be named after the late Senator Arthur Capper

because of his devotion to agriculture during his three decades in public life. Every loyal Kansan and millions of readers of Capper publications throughout the Nation will say "amen" to the suggestion. One of my finest memories is my nearly 60 years of friendship with Arthur Capper—from the time he was a printer on the Garnett Review and J. K. Hudson's old Topeka Capital, to his purchase of the North Topeka Mail and Breeze, retaining Tom McNeal as editor—and then the money he borrowed from the Mulvane bank to make a downpayment on the Topeka Capital. In all his public career he took the position that he was the servant and not the master of his constituents.

## A GOVERNMENT LAWYER LOOKS AT LITTLE ROCK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Warren Olney III is a distinguished California lawyer who served with marked distinction as Assistant Attorney General of the United States for several years in the immediate past.

In Monterey, Calif., on Thursday, October 3 last, he spoke to a Conference of Barristers of the State Bar of California on the subject, "A Government Lawyer Looks at Little Rock." His presentation of the series of events surrounding the unhappy situation in Little Rock, Ark., is excellent and clear.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Olney's address be incorporated in the body of the RECORD for easy availability to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOVERNMENT LAWYER LOOKS AT LITTLE ROCK

(Address by Warren Olney III, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, delivered before the Conference of Barristers of the State Bar of California, Monterey, Calif., October 3, 1957)

I am grateful for the invitation to address the Conference of Barristers of the State Bar of California today. It is a privilege for any lawyer to meet with and speak to the younger members of our profession who are interested in trial work.

In June when I received your invitation I was delighted to accept, partly because I naturally welcome a good excuse for returning home to California for a visit and partly because of an even more understandable desire to renew my ties with old friends and associates and with the State Bar of California in view of the plan which I have had for a long time to leave Washington and return this fall to California permanently.

When I accepted your invitation—only last June—I was rather hard put to think of the subject that I should talk to you about. Now I have no choice. So quickly has the crisis in our Government arisen in Little Rock.

Torrents of vitriolic oratory have already begun to flow on this subject and will, I have no doubt, continue to spew forth for a long time. I do not seek to swell this cresting flood.

What I shall try to do this morning is to tell you as dispassionately as I can how the legal developments in this matter looked at the time to the Government lawyers most concerned.

The fateful developments of September 1957 were preceded by litigation in which the Government took no part but which nonetheless is an essential part of the story.

After "a great civil war, testing whether this Nation or any nation * * * conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal * * * can long endure," the Constitution of the United States was amended to provide that "No State shall * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States by unanimous decision held that "separate educational facilities [on a racial basis] are essentially unequal" and that those against whom such restrictions are enforced are thereby deprived "of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment" (*Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483)).

At this point I want to inject parenthetically some observations on the positions of the Government lawyer—all Government lawyers. Other persons can and have questioned the wisdom, reasoning, and even the validity of this decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation cases. Some persons, even Members of the Senate of the United States, have urged massive resistance to putting the principle of this decision into practice. The Government lawyer cannot indulge in any such questioning. Whatever his personal views, or his likes and dislikes, it is unthinkable that in his official actions he would fail to accept as controlling a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court as to the scope and meaning of the Constitution of the United States. Every Government lawyer has taken an oath "to support the Constitution of the United States" and to him that means the Constitution as interpreted and declared by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Government lawyer is as much bound by his oath to support the Constitution as is the President himself.

Only 3 days after the decision of the Supreme Court of the school segregation cases in May of 1954, the board of education of the city of Little Rock publicly announced that it intended to comply with the constitutional requirements and that it would proceed to develop a plan for eliminating the racial restrictions upon attendance in the Little Rock schools. In May of the following year the Little Rock School Board approved and published its plan for the gradual elimination of racial segregation from the schools. The action taken by the school board up to this point was voluntary and local. The Federal Government played no part in its adoption.

Subsequent to the adoption of the plan, the superintendent of schools not only made it public but read and explained it to approximately 200 local groups and organizations in an effort to obtain public acceptance of its provisions. The school board which had approved the plan was reelected with the plan's adoption as an issue. At this point the most serious opposition to the plan came from those who regarded its program of integration as too slow.

The plan proposed was indeed deliberate. It was to be accomplished over a period of not less than 8 years from its announcement. It was to begin in September of 1957 with the admission into the Little Rock Central High School, having a student body of approximately 2,000 students, of only 10 Negro students. The plan was promptly challenged in the courts as being too gradual. A suit was filed in the United States district court by a group of Negro students seeking admission to the school, challenging the school board's program on the ground that it was so gradual that it did not comply with the requirement that racial segregation be eliminated from the schools with all deliberate speed. This challenge failed in the district court, which held that the school board's plan was consistent with the law and should be approved.

In view of the repeated references of Gov. Orval Faubus to "imported" Federal judges, it is worth noting that this first decision made on August 28, 1956, approving the school board's plan was rendered by Judge John E. Miller, regularly assigned to the western district of Arkansas, and a resident of Arkansas and former Congressman and Senator for that State.

An appeal was taken from the decision of the district court, but the judgment was affirmed, the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit also holding that the school board's plan was in conformity with the law. *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (243 Fed. (2d) 361 (1957)). The Federal Government had no occasion to take any part in the litigation I have just described.

The very first action taken by the Department of Justice with respect to the situation in Little Rock was taken on request from Gov. Orval Faubus himself. At his personal request, Mr. A. B. Caldwell, my assistant for civil rights in the Criminal Division and himself a native and former resident of Arkansas, was sent to Little Rock on August 28, 1957, to confer privately with the Governor. At the time this request for a conference seemed curious to us. The Governor's subsequent action has given it a significance which was not appreciated by us at the time. The Governor informed Mr. Caldwell that he had reason to apprehend there might be some disturbance at the Central High School when school opened on September 3 if the Negro children who were eligible for admission under the school board's plan should present themselves. No statement was ever made by him as to the basis for these apprehensions. The conferences consisted in largest part of questions addressed to Mr. Caldwell as to what action would or could be taken by the Department of Justice in the event that disturbances over the school board's plan did develop.

In response, and of necessity, the Governor was informed that the development of a disturbance at the school would not of itself provide any basis for action by Federal authorities. It was pointed out that the United States had had nothing to do with the school board's plan and was not a party to the litigation in which the plan had been approved. The Governor inquired about the action taken by the Department last year in connection with the disturbances that arose over the schools at Clinton, Tenn. It was pointed out to him that in that instance the Federal district court had issued an injunction at the request of the school board against certain named persons from interfering with the efforts of the school board to put its plan into effect and that when this order was violated, and the obstruction continued, that the court had requested the assistance of the United States Attorney and of the Department of Justice in making its order and process effectual.

At this conference Governor Faubus informed Mr. Caldwell that at the suggestion of the Governor himself a suit had been filed in the Arkansas Chancery Court by a group of mothers having children in the Central High School seeking an injunction to restrain the school board from admitting the Negro children in accordance with its plan. The Governor stated he hoped this suit would be successful as the granting of such an injunction would continue the school on a segregated status and thus prevent trouble from arising. The very next day the suit in the Arkansas Chancery Court which the Governor had mentioned came on for a hearing and the Governor himself appeared as a witness in support of the prayer for an injunction. Here again the Governor failed to give any specific information as to the basis for his apprehensions of trouble if the Negro students were admitted to school.

Notwithstanding the inadequate nature of this showing, the injunction was granted

by the chancery court. This was followed immediately by application being made by the school board to the Federal district court for an order prohibiting the State court from interfering with the efforts of the school board to carry its plan for the admission of the Negro students into effect.

It was at this point that United States District Judge Ronald N. Davies of North Dakota, who has been referred to by Governor Faubus as an imported judge, as though he were a foreigner, first entered these proceedings. The reason for his participation is entirely normal and is as follows: Judge Trimble, of Little Rock, retired from the bench in January 1957, leaving no Federal judge permanently assigned to sit in Little Rock. For this reason the case involving the school board's plan had been assigned to Judge John E. Miller, who had issued the order of August 28, 1956, approving the board's plan, and who is regularly assigned to sit at Fort Smith, Ark., 160 miles away from Little Rock. Quite aside from this litigation and because of the accumulating cases on the court's calendar in Little Rock, Chief Judge Archibald K. Gardner of the eighth circuit assigned Judge Davies of North Dakota, whose calendar was light, to sit in Little Rock for the purpose of clearing the calendar there. Judge Davies was actually sitting in Little Rock hearing cases when the Arkansas Chancery Court issued its injunction to restrain the school board.

With the prospect of suddenly expanding litigation in Little Rock, the attorneys for the school board complained to Judge Miller in Fort Smith about the time, distance, and expense involved in his trying to continue to handle the case from a distance of 160 miles. As a result Judge Miller requested Chief Judge Gardner of the eighth circuit to transfer the school board litigation to Judge Davies who was then holding court on the scene in Little Rock, and this request was granted. This is the reason and the manner in which Judge Davies was assigned to the case. This is the assignment Governor Faubus represents as sinister.

As a result of these proceedings Judge Davies, on August 30, acting on petition of the school board, enjoined plaintiffs in the Arkansas Chancery Court and all other persons from interfering with the effort of the school board from carrying into effect its plan to admit the Negro students to Central High School.

With this order in effect, and without any effort having been made to appeal, review, or supersede it, and having full knowledge of its terms, Governor Faubus called to active duty certain units of the Arkansas National Guard which he directed to surround Central High School. He stated he took this action to prevent any disturbance of the public peace and good order, although here again he failed to particularize as to his reasons for believing that the peace might be disturbed.

At this time the Governor informed the press that he had not ordered the Guard to exclude the Negro children but had left it to the discretion of the Guard as to how they should undertake to preserve the peace. But he did state that it was his belief that peace and good order could not be maintained if the Negro children were admitted.

In view of this, the school board addressed a public request to the Negro children not to attempt to enter the school until the dilemma was resolved.

School opened September 3 with Governor Faubus' Guardsmen at their stations, prepared to bar entry to all Negro students although none attempted to enter on that day.

With these developments the school board on September 3 petitioned the Federal court for instructions as to whether the board should recall its request to Negro students not to appear. In response the court directed the board to withdraw the request and to proceed with the acceptance of the Negro students forthwith. The court stated that he would accept at face value the Governor's statement that he had no purpose excepting to preserve order. The next day nine Negro students appeared at the high school and tried to enter, but the Guardsmen stood shoulder to shoulder and they were repulsed. The effort was not immediately renewed.

The school board now applied to the Federal court for a temporary suspension of its plan because of the effect of the presence of the Guardsmen on the schoolchildren. Judge Davies held that this was not legal justification for the abandonment of the plan and of the board's attempt to comply with the Constitution and the law. Up to this point the Department of Justice had taken no part in these proceedings for the very good reason that there is no provision of law under which the Attorney General could have taken action.

Judge Davies now appealed to the United States attorney and the Attorney General to assist the court in determining why and by whom the order of the court was being obstructed and the plans of the school board thwarted. This inquiry was undertaken by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report on the subject was submitted to the court on September 9. The most significant development in this investigation was the development of documentary proof that in his original instructions to the National Guard Governor Faubus had failed to order the Guard to protect the Negro students who were applying for admission to the school, but on the contrary, had ordered the Guard expressly to exclude them all from the school premises. This was a deliberate nullification of the Constitution and laws of the United States perpetrated by Governor Faubus with the force of his troops. It was at the same time a frustration of the orders of the district court.

After learning of the order given to his Guardsmen by Governor Faubus, the court entered a formal order reciting that in the opinion of the court, "the public interest in the administration of justice should be represented in these proceedings." He requested the Attorney General and the United States attorney to enter the case and assist as amicus curiae. Judge Davies specifically empowered the Government to submit pleadings, evidence, arguments and briefs in the litigation, as well as to initiate such further proceedings as might be appropriate. In addition, the court directed the Government to serve on the Governor and the commanders of the National Guard detachment an order to show cause why an injunction should not be granted against their further interference with and obstruction of the previous order of the court that the school board's plan of integration should be carried into immediate effect.

The appropriate pleadings were filed and on September 10 Governor Faubus emerged from his self-imposed siege in his mansion at Little Rock and accepted service without difficulty. The hearing on petition for an injunction was set down for September 20.

As lawyers you will readily perceive that these proceedings are unusual. They are, however, not without precedent.

It would be strange, indeed, if the judiciary lacked the power to appeal to the executive branch of the Government for assistance where the orders and processes of the court are being deliberately and forcibly thwarted and obstructed.

In the case of *Universal Oil Company* v. *Root Refining Company* (328 U. S. 575, 581 (1946)) the Supreme Court held that for the purpose of vindicating its honor and making its process effective as a means of administering justice, a Federal court can always call on the law officers of the United States to serve as amici.

The power of a Federal court to review the action of a governor of a State in using military force to achieve ends which are unconstitutional has also been settled by precedent. I shall not attempt to give you a brief of the law or even to mention the holdings on the varied aspects of this question. As illustrative, however, I call the attention of those of you who are interested, to the cases of *Sterling* v. *Constantin* (287 U. S. 378 (1932)), *United States* v. *Phillips* (33 Fed. Supp. 261 (D. C. Okla., N. D., 1949)), with further proceedings in 312 U. S. 246 (1941) and *Strutwear Knitting Co.* v. *Olson* (13 Fed. Supp. 384 (D. C. Minn. 1936)).

In the last named case the National Guard was used by a governor to close a factory to prevent probable loss of life and property from the acts of a mob objecting to its operation. The court held that this was not a permissible use of force saying:

"It is certain that while the State government is functioning, it cannot suppress disorders the object of which is to deprive citizens of their lawful rights by using its forces to assist in carrying out the unlawful purposes of those who create the disorders, or by suppressing rights which it is the duty of the State to defend. The use of troops or police for such purposes would breed violence. It would constitute an assurance to those who resort to violence to attain their ends that, if they gathered in sufficient numbers to constitute a menace to life, the forces of law would not only not oppose them, but would actually assist them in accomplishing their objective. There could be but one final result, namely, a complete breakdown of government and a resort to force both by the law-abiding and the lawless."

It will undoubtedly occur to some of you that if the law is this clear, the matter might have been brought to a head more quickly by the Government seeking an immediate temporary restraining order instead of petitioning for a preliminary injunction with a 10-day delay prior to hearing. This course and the date of the hearing were set by Judge Davies. Perhaps he wanted to give the Governor an opportunity to conform to the requirements of the Federal Constitution and law as he had promised to do when he met with President Eisenhower in Newport. Possibly Judge Davies was reluctant to believe that a governor of a State would deliberately and intentionally use his troops to obstruct the orders of a Federal court and attempt to nullify the Constitution and laws of the United States. In any event the court was definitely of the view that the Governor should be served with notice and afforded an opportunity to be heard before any injunction issued against him or his officers.

You will readily recall the next developments. Governor Faubus made his dramatic flight to Rhode Island to confer with President Eisenhower about the situation. While the official statements that followed this meeting were noncommittal about details, Governor Faubus did state publicly that he recognized integration as the "law of the land." It seemed possible that the meeting might have achieved its purpose of solving the impasse without force or ultimatum. It even seemed possible that the Governor might either withdraw the Guardsmen from the high school or revise his order so as to admit Negro students under the protection of the Guard, taking such action without the necessity of a hearing and order from the United States court. But Governor Faubus did not follow any such course.

On September 20 he entered an appearance in the district court by counsel, though not in person. After a series of dilatory motions and challenges to the jurisdiction of the court had been denied, the Governor's counsel walked out of court without waiting for the taking of any testimony, refusing in the

name of the Governor to recognize the court's authority or jurisdiction.

Judge Davies then proceeded without further delay to take testimony and enter appropriate findings of fact and conclusions of law. The principal finding was that since September 2, and up to the time of the hearing on September 20, the units of the Arkansas National Guard had remained at Central High School and had continued to prevent eligible Negro students from attending the school, pursuant to the order issued to the Guard by the Governor of Arkansas. The court found that these acts directly obstructed and interfered with the carrying out and effectuation of the court's orders of August 28, 1956, and September 3, 1957, contrary to the due and proper administration of justice. On this basis the court then issued the appropriate injunction.

It is important to note that the court did not order the Governor to remove the National Guard from the high school or its vicinity. The court continued to leave it within the discretion of the Governor to determine whether the presence of the Guardsmen at the school was needed in order to preserve the public peace and order. All that the court required was that the Governor and the Guardsmen desist from preventing the eligible Negro students from attending school and from preventing the school board from putting into execution its plan of integration as approved by the court.

That evening Governor Faubus told a radio-television audience he would "exhaust every legal remedy to appeal this order. However * * * I will comply." The troops were withdrawn, but to date no steps have been taken to appeal.

The events that followed the opening of school the next Monday are not likely to be forgotten by any of us. You will recall that an unruly mob quickly began to gather. You have seen for yourselves the pictures of white men, their faces flushed with hate, striking and kicking the colored news photographers who happened to be present, and chasing other Negroes who ventured into the vicinity. You will recall that the Negro students were received into the school, but that the uproar caused by the mob outside was so great that the school authorities, the mayor, and the city police requested the Negro children to retire from the school until better protection could be provided.

The requests of the school and city authorities for assistance against this violence went unheeded by Governor Faubus. It became all too plain that the public agencies of the city of Little Rock and the State of Arkansas either could not or would not provide the Negro students with the equal protection of the laws guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States. The mob, having been inflamed against the Negroes, was on the verge of breaking into extremes of violence because of the lack of any real effort by State authorities to curb it.

Consequently, before the day was over President Eisenhower issued his proclamation calling on the mob to cease and desist from its obstruction at the school and to disperse forthwith. The President was acting under authority of chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code which I shall discuss in a moment.

On the following morning the mob again gathered in front of the Central High School, notwithstanding the President's proclamation, obviously bent on again preventing the court's order relating to the admission of Negro children to the school from being carried out. Thereupon the President issued an Executive order "Providing Assistance for the Removal of the Obstruction of Justice Within the State of Arkansas." This order authorized and directed the Secretary of Defense to order into the active military service of the United States as he may deem appropriate any or all units of the National Guard to serve for an indefinite period and until relieved by appropriate orders, to utilize the Armed Forces of the United States and to take all appropriate steps to enforce any orders for the removal of obstruction of justice in the State of Arkansas with respect to enrollment and attendance in the Little Rock School District.

The Secretary acted without delay. A unit of the Armed Forces was sent to Little Rock at once, while the Arkansas National Guard was federalized at the same time. The mob was dispersed efficiently and with a minimum of incident. The Negro students returned to school under protection of the soldiers.

Now we are confronted with the extraordinary spectacle of a public school operating with soldiers present to afford physical protection for some of its students from an incipient mob and from the violence of outsiders.

It is too bad that the Federal Government had to intervene, but no other course was possible. When the Governor of Arkansas determined to use the National Guard for the unlawful purpose of preventing integration in Little Rock, as planned by its school board and ordered by the Federal court, Federal intervention became inevitable. The necessity arose from this open defiance of the law and of the courts. While the normal agencies for law enforcement were adequate to keep the peace, they had been ordered to nullify the law.

Now it is being claimed that the course followed by the President was illegal.

The President in his inaugural oath swears and affirms that he will to the best of his ability "protect and preserve the Constitution of the United States." So long as the Constitution stands; so long as the Supreme Court's interpretation stands; so long as the President maintains his oath, the Federal Government must step in if State and local authorities deny to citizens the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

The President's duty rests in the Constitution, but the manner of carrying it out has been spelled out in detail by the Congress. Section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code provides that "Whenever the President considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages * * * against the authority of the United States, make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States in any State or Territory by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, he may call into Federal service such of the militia of any State, and use such of the Armed Forces, as he considers necessary to enforce those laws." And the next section provides additional authority. Section 334 authorizes the proclamation to the mob to disperse as a preliminary step to calling upon military authority. In this instance the President issued his proclamation on September 23.

There is nothing old about this statute and nothing new about its principle. The statutes to which I have just referred were revised and reenacted as recently as 1956. It is not without interest to note that the subcommittee of the Senate that approved his language was headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, while the chairman of the full committee which unanimously approved its passage was presided over by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi. It passed both Houses without objection.

The principle of this law long antedates the Civil War. It was originally enacted in 1792. It was utilized 2 years later by President George Washington in suppressing the Whiskey Rebellion and has been utilized by later Presidents on at least 13 occasions. The legality of the action taken by the President will never be successfully challenged.

This is as far as it seems proper for me to go in my recital of events. Obviously there are matters of interest pending and under investigation at the present time, but it is not in order for me to discuss them.

By way of conclusion, however, I can state that no one should have been in any doubt in the past and none can be in any doubt in the future as to the course that the President—any President—must follow when the troops of a State are used to nullify the Constitution and laws of the United States, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, and to defy the orders of the courts of the United States. No President can abandon the positions taken and sustained by Abraham Lincoln through 4 years of bitter Civil War. A wider understanding and acceptance of this fact in the South would be in the interest of national peace and tranquillity.

## BUILT-IN RECESSION STABILIZERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Sunday New York Times carries another excellent economic analysis by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr. Mr. Dale points out how enormously important the so-called built-in stabilizers have been in this recession, and the recessions of 1948, 1949 and 1953 and 1954, in preventing the terrible devastation of a full-fledged depression. Mr. Dale's article suggests that the income cushions of social security, unemployment compensation, and farm-price supports are the three principal safeguards of our economy.

Mr. President, if we are to stop this economic slump, we should act as quickly as possible to provide urgently needed substance and strength for these cushions. Unemployment compensation has been eroded by inflation and by competition between the States to keep this compensation at a low competitive level. Social security has become pitifully inadequate because of the rise in the cost of living. Literally millions of social-security pensioners are little better off with their social-security checks than they would be in relying on relief. Mr. President, this Congress should act as expeditiously as possible to substantially improve and increase both these programs. It can do so without taking a cent from general revenues, without unbalancing the budget by a penny. Both these programs are self-financing. An extremely modest adjustment in the taxes relating to these programs can provide revenues that will be enormously beneficial in our economy. Whether or not farm-price supports continue to provide a cushion for our economy is now in the lap of the President of the United States. Congress can act, however, to provide for a far better long-range farm program in the course of this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS RECESSION AND PAST UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE—BUILT-IN STABILIZERS VARY PATTERN FROM THAT OF GREAT DEPRESSION

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—Private, capitalist economies have business slumps. There have been about 24 in the last 100 years in the United States. The business cycle ap-

pears to be a fact of life that probably cannot be escaped.

In comparing the 1957–58 slump with its predecessors—chiefly the great crash that began in 1929–30 and the two previous postwar slumps of 1948–49 and 1953–54—three questions are in order:

Has the pace of decline to date been materially different?

Was the condition of the economy before the slump materially different?

What has the Government done about the slumps in the past and how well did it work?

The pace of decline depends in part on the beginning date selected and the measurements used. But, assuming the current recession began last July, it can be said in general that the pace of the 1957–58 slump has been a little steeper for its first 7 months than the other two postwar recessions, certainly stiffer than 1953–54, but that all three have been less steep than in 1929–30.

KEY INDEX

For example, the key index of overall industrial production fell 8 to 9 percent in the first two postwar slumps and 9.7 percent this time during the first 7 months, but it fell 13.1 percent in 1929–30. Nonfarm employment was off 2.3 percent in 1953–54, 3.3 percent in 1948–49, 3.1 percent this time and 5.4 percent in the same period of the great crash.

There is one other significant difference, related not only to the pace of the decline, but to major changes in the economy since the great depression. This is the movement in personal incomes.

In 1929–30, personal income fell off about 8 percent in the first 7 months of the slump. This meant a sharp and severe drop in purchasing power.

Since that time there have been added unemployment compensation, other social security payments affecting mainly the aged, and farm price supports. These income cushions, otherwise known as built-in stabilizers, have worked beautifully in the postwar slumps.

Compared with the 8 percent decline in personal income in 1929–30, the decline in 1948–49's first 7 months was 3.1 percent, while in 1953–54 it was 1.9 percent and 1.3 percent in 1957–58. This means that purchasing power in each postwar slump has fallen far less than production and considerably less than employment.

If the differences in the pace of decline between prewar and postwar are notable, the differences in the condition of the economy before the slumps are even more important.

BASIC CONDITION

One basic condition applied to all four: There was an inflation of one kind or another preceding the slump. In 1929, it was not primarily a consumer price inflation but a specialized inflation in stocks, real estate and some commodities. It was still an inflation, however, according to most modern analysis.

But it is the differences that count. All three postwar slumps began with these differences from 1929:

1. There was no preceding runaway stock market boom. New legislation made some of the worst features of the 1920 boom impossible. The amount of stock market credit was regulated and totaled only one-fifth or less of the amount in 1929.

2. The banks had Federal deposit insurance. This virtually barred runs on banks and the kind of financial collapse that characterized the great depression.

3. Housing credit was much sounder. The concept of the amortized mortgage loan, insured by the Government in many cases, had replaced the old short-term loan payable in full on maturity.

4. Federal spending made up a far larger part of the total economy. In 1929 the Federal budget came to only about 3 percent of the gross national product, but today it is about 18 percent. This is spending that, if anything, automatically increases in slumps and certainly does not dry up.

5. Incomes were more evenly distributed.

All of these changes are, of course, in addition to the aforementioned built-in-stabilizers.

How about differences and similarities at the outset of each of the three postwar slumps?

They all had been preceded by inflation. They all had been preceded by what was probably excessive buildup in inventories. But otherwise there were differences.

The precondition for the 1948–49 slump was essentially the huge surge of consumer buying after World War II, accompanied by rapid consumer price inflation. The 1953–54 slump was preceded by the Korean war and a big surge of Government spending—spending that began falling in late 1953 and helped trigger the slump.

Before the present slump, the key features of the economy were probably the huge bulge in business investment in plant and equipment, and an only slightly smaller bulge in consumer installment credit.

In effect, excesses seem to breed slumps. One of the main reasons for extra concern about the present slump is that the main excess was in plant and equipment spending. The fear is that this major item in overall demand will be sliding downward all through 1958 and well into 1959, on the ground that industrial capacity has fully caught up with consumer and other demands.

INADVERTENT MEASURES

That leads to Government remedies, and the thinking behind them. Surprisingly, it turns out that the major Government measures in each of the postwar slumps before this one, aside from the aforementioned remedies already built into the system, were taken almost inadvertently. In 1929, of course, economic thought was much different from today's, and the Government did not feel called on to act early in the game.

President Herbert Hoover seems, in the light of history, to have vacillated between a belief that things would soon improve and a belief that something should be done. But there is little doubt that his underlying belief was that radical Government measures—necessarily involving a deficit in the budget—wou'd be unsound and would do more harm than good.

However, ironically, he did cut taxes in November 1929. The trouble was that taxes were already so low that the saving for a man earning, say, $5,000 a year was less than $10 a year. The President also proposed to Congress and got some increase in Government public-works programs.

In the 1948–49 slump the built-in stabilizers performed admirably. Outside of that, the Government took the familiar measures of easing credit and trying to spur housing by increasing Government purchases of mortgages. But the big help seems to have come from two actions unrelated to the slump.

One was a tax cut enacted by the Republican Congress over President Harry S. Truman's veto in 1948, well before the slump began. The other was the beginning of the Marshall plan, in which 1949 was the first big-spending year. This created a big demand for American goods to be shipped to Europe.

EASING OF CREDIT

In 1953–54, there was also a major easing of credit and the array of housing measures. This time the credit easing probably made some difference, because it followed a period of rather tight money, unlike 1948–49. Other comparatively minor measures were taken, including an effort—not altogether successful—to speed up Government spending on some programs.

But the big item in that slump was a $7,500 million tax cut—$5 billion of which had been already written into law 2 years before. All the administration had to do was let this big tax cut go into effect. It did so, despite the fiscal orthodoxy of the then Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, because Government spending was heading downward at the time following the Korean war, and the tax cut did not increase the deficit much.

This postwar experience is an illustration of why the present situation is such a difficult one. True, the gods have once again provided a lucky break—the postsputnik increase in defense spending.

But there is a real doubt that this will be enough. Hence the widespread belief that this recession is providing much the most severe test of whether modern American governments can and will take the right actions to cure successfully a serious slump.

## TAX CUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, two interesting articles were published in this morning's newspapers. One in the cautious, careful, conservative New York Times, is entitled "Tax Cuts as a Tonic." I agree with the statement in the New York Times. Statements by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the distinguished Committee for Economic Development, which includes some of the Nation's outstanding businessmen, that if energetic antirecession action will be needed shortly, a major tax reduction promises to be the most effective most quickly.

This morning the Washington Post and Times Herald published an article entitled "Eventually, Why Not Now?" written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which urges that Congress reduce taxes. The article states, in part:

A tax cut will have all the more force because any stimulant always is more effective if it is applied early, whether to an ailing economy or an ailing body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 24, 1958]

TAX CUTS AS A TONIC

Two additional and influential voices have been raised in favor of Government tax reduction as the primary weapon for reversing the current recession. The Committee for Economic Development has urged a general 20 percent cut in personal income taxes for the next year if the decline in the economy persists through April. Dr. Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, goes one step farther. He advocates an immediate and permanent $5 billion cut in taxes, and expresses fear that if this step is not taken in the next few weeks we may have to resort later to drastic medicine.

Until last Saturday the impression was general that the administration had made up its mind that if massive intervention to reverse the recession were required it would resort to a large tax cut. Two weeks ago, for example, the President's letter to Republican leaders in Congress denounced proposals for huge Federal public works programs as efforts to resuscitate the WPA and other pump-priming schemes of the 1930's. Now, however, confusion has been created by

Vice President NIXON's indication that the administration has not yet made a choice between tax relief and major public-works programs.

In this situation it seems wise to point out the great advantage tax cuts have over public works in the situation which may be confronting us. A tax cut would immediately increase the spendable income of income recipients all over the country, thus stimulating demand. If the tax relief included reduction in excise taxes, for example, on automobiles, it would permit lower prices, also tending to stimulate sales. Public works, on the other hand, are necessarily slow to get under way and could not stimulate demand as rapidly as tax cuts.

We are not, of course, required to place exclusive reliance upon either antirecession weapon. The Government's public-works program is being stepped up moderately now. Moreover, there is available a type of public works—school construction—whose sharp increase would serve a major social purpose as well as help combat the recession. But as we have indicated before, we believe—as do Dr. Burns and the CED—that if energetic antirecession action is needed shortly it is a major tax reduction which promises to be most effective most quickly.

---

[From the Washington Post of March 24, 1958]

EVENTUALLY, WHY NOT NOW?

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

When the unencouraging preliminary figures for March employment and business activity were laid before the Cabinet last week, the response was gloomily impassive. This raises the puzzling question: "Eventually, why not now?"

Eventually, if the final returns of March are bad, the administration is heavily committed to a bold, business-stimulating tax cut. The President himself promised the country a March upturn only a few weeks ago.

Other leading figures of the Eisenhower team repeatedly have explained that we must wait and see the March outcome, and they have indicated that action to cut taxes would follow if the March outcome proved disappointing.

Virtually all the indexes now suggest that the March outcome will be decidedly disappointing. New applications for unemployment relief have dropped fractionally. The month may well show a modest increase of persons having jobs—which the White House staff immediately will claim as justification of the President's incautious forecast.

But although the total of employed may rise, the figures already available almost surely mean that the crucial unemployment total will either hold about even or quite possibly rise, too. As family incomes are lowered by cuts in work hours, more and more housewives and young people are looking for jobs to keep pork chops on the family table.

Overall, the American economy looks like doing no better in March than in February, and there are some who say the curve is still downward in a month of normal seasonal pickup.

Unanimity among economists is never to be looked for. But there are not many Government economists who have not already delivered an unfavorable verdict on the month of March, except for men directly attached to the President's staff, like Gabriel Hauge.

The White House experts and some in the Treasury continue to argue that the economy's March performance can be judged only when all the statistics are finally available in mid-April.

Maybe Hauge is right. Certainly, it is now the White House intention to stick to the wait-and-see line, at least until mid-April. Even Vice President NIXON, who was all for an immediate tax cut only 2 weeks ago, has swung round to the case for wait-and-see. But the odds are clearly about 3 to 1 that, when mid-April rolls around, the final returns on March will give the administration no choice but to take the promised action to cut taxes or openly to declare that tax cutting is not such a good remedy after all.

Therefore the question: "Eventually, why not now?" It has all the more force because any stimulant always is more effective if it is applied early, whether to an ailing economy or an ailing body. It is a really puzzling question, but it has an answer that comes in three parts.

In the first place, a big tax cut is a very big step, especially in view of the worsening foreign and defense situations, which may make heavy future demands on the economy. For that reason, if for no other, the keyman on the President's advisory team, Treasury Secretary Robert Anderson, takes Hauge's line, not hostile to a tax cut if needed, but wanting all the evidence before the decision.

In the second place, there is an identifiable school of thought in the administration, probably stronger in the Federal Reserve Board than elsewhere, unkindly described as the "further through the wringer" school, in which inflation has been the great fear, all through the Eisenhower years.

The "further through the wringer" school holds that the current depression has simply got to be reflected in serious price cuts before it will be safe to take stimulating action with a naturally inflationary tendency, like a tax reduction. Otherwise, this school says, a stimulated upturn now will lead surely to a grave inflationary situation 2 years from now.

The third part of the answer is clearly the President himself. In the President's attitude, there are more than hints of the strong influence of his businessmen friends, many of whom have views about Government interference in the economy that do not differ greatly from former President Hoover's.

Then, too, as his reaction to the sputnik also showed, Dwight Eisenhower nowadays greatly prefers immobility to motion. The President is, therefore, the strongest defender of doing nothing now to lower taxes, even though it appears almost certain the tax-cut stimulant will have to be applied later.

---

## SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 21, 1958, the New York Times published a powerfully persuasive editorial urging that the Congress give its immediate attention to a program for school construction. This editorial asks this crucial question:

If we are going to embark on a national policy of accelerating highways, housing, and the like, what excuse is there for not also including schools in such a program?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included in the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHY NOT SCHOOLS?

In an amazingly short space of time, reminiscent of the early days of the New Deal, both Houses of Congress have now passed their first important measure to combat the recession. This is a housing-finance bill, designed to stimulate construction of 200,000 new units and thereby furnish employment to some 500,000 persons this year. A total of $1,850 million is provided, mostly for purchase of Government-insured mortgages.

Meanwhile the Senate has already started hearings on a bill to set up a $2 billion Federal loan fund to States and localities for public works construction, thereby multiplying the present authorization for this purpose by 20 times. And the President has asked for a speedup in over $2 billion of already authorized local projects financially aided by the Federal Government, including slum clearance, public housing, college housing, small-town sewer and waterworks and rural electrification. Defense Department contracts for military vehicles—$100 million worth—are also being accelerated.

Inasmuch as unemployment—which seems to be increasing—is concentrated primarily in the manufacturing, construction, and transportation industries, these various moves will undoubtedly have some beneficial effect on the economy. Whether they will be sufficient, and whether they can get under way quickly enough, are debatable questions. But in all the administration proposals for public works, whether of large scale or small scale, of short duration or long duration, we notice that one major area is consistently overlooked.

That is a program for school construction. If we are going to embark on a national policy of accelerating highways, housing, and the like, what excuse is there for not also including schools in such a program? The tremendous, pressing need for additional schools is by this time beyond question. The administration itself has until this year advocated a school-construction program. Now that we are in a recession, when everybody is talking—and in some cases much too glibly—about public works as an antirecession device, why are schools suddenly forgotten?

We do not pretend that a school-construction program could be undertaken overnight, nor that if it were adopted it would necessarily have an immediate effect on unemployment. Neither would many other public works programs that are being talked about. But if this Nation is going to start plunging in on public works in a big way, what public work is more desperately needed than schools?

---

## DAIRY COMMODITIES PRICE SLASH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Friday afternoon the Secretary of Agriculture announced the prices at which dairy commodities will be supported this year in accordance with his recent announcement of a reduction to 75 percent of the new, lower parity equivalent which he has put into effect.

These prices spell a future of despair and injustice to the dairy producers of this Nation. Mr. Benson's order will cut dairy farmers' incomes in my State alone by at least $40 million. It will snatch this $40 million out of the cash registers of Wisconsin businessmen who trade with the farmers.

Worst of all, Mr. President, Mr. Benson's order will give a powerful, dangerous downward shove to the economy of the whole Nation—at the very time we may be faltering on the brink of the unthinkable disaster of a major depression.

I want to present the specific details of what Mr. Benson's order does to the prices farmers will receive for their milk and dairy products:

When Mr. Benson took office in January 1953, the support price for manufacturing milk was $3.85 per hundred pounds. He has reduced it for the next year to only $3.03. This is a cut of 82 cents per hundred pounds.

But this is only part of the story. Farmers' costs last month had risen to the highest point in all history. Consequently, today's dollar buys far less than it did in 1953.

The thing that is important to the farmer, Mr. President, is how much his milk will buy. The combination of sharply reduced price for milk and the sharply increased cost of farm operations means that 100 pounds of milk at Mr. Benson's reduced prices will buy only 77 percent as much as it would when he took office.

This is a shocking cut in the farmer's purchasing power—a slash of 23 percent in his buying power in 5 years' time.

I have a table showing the extent of the various price changes for dairy products that have been made since 1952 by Secretary Benson. I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Changes in support level and purchase prices for dairy commodities, 1952–58*

[All figures are supplied by U. S. Department of Agriculture]

| Commodity | Marketing year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1952 | 1957 | 1958 |
| Cheese (pound) | $0.38¼ | $0.35 | $0.32½ |
| Dried milk (pound): | | | |
| Spray | .17 | .16 | .14 |
| Roller | .15 | .14 | .12 |
| Butter (pound) | .67¾ | .59½ | .57½ |
| Support objective, manufacturing milk (hundredweight) | 3.85 | 3.25 | 3.03 |

## PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S PROMISES TO FARMERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, only 8 days remain before the threatened cut in price supports for dairy commodities is scheduled to take effect.

Congress has acted to avert this calamity to our farmers and to our national economy. The decision now rests with the President of the United States.

I wish to compliment the able majority leader for his remarks to the press over the weekend on this important question. In my opinion, he touched on the most vital aspect of this matter when he emphasized that the further reductions in farm prices which Secretary Benson has ordered will cause additional unemployment.

Mr. President, if the President vetoes the resolution adopted by Congress to suspend further cuts in farm prices, he will, in effect, slam the factory gates against more workers in American industry, and turn additional breadwinners into the streets to join the ranks of the unemployed.

I hope the President will consider these consequences of his action as he weighs his decision on this resolution.

I hope he will consider also the promises he has made to the farmers of this country—promises which, unhappily, he has never kept. After 5 years of steadily declining farm prices—a decline of farm prices which has been encouraged and speeded by reductions in the level of price supports—it would be well for the President to give belated attention to his own pledge to the farmers to help them to achieve higher prices and higher incomes.

I call the attention of my colleagues to what Mr. Eisenhower promised the farmers 5 years ago. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the promises made by General Eisenhower to the farmers.

There being no objection, the quotations from General Eisenhower's 1952 campaign speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER'S PROMISES TO THE FARMERS

Following are the major specific promises to farmers made by President Eisenhower in his 1952 election campaign; quoted directly from the official text of his speech at the national plowing contest, Kasson, Minn., September 6, 1952:

"And here and now, without any 'ifs' or 'buts,' I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. These price supports are only fair to the farmer to underwrite the exceptional risk he is now taking. * * *

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal. * * * And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity.

"We must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms. * * * They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

"The Democrats * * * keep saying, 'There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan.' But we can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

"I give you this positive assurance: The Republican Party will use all the power it legitimately can use to see that American farmers obtain their full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, these were the solemn promises to American farmers made by the Republican candidate in 1952. As he debates with his conscience as to whether to sign or veto the resolution which will merely prevent Secretary Benson from making the farmers' situation even worse in 1958—after 5 years of steady worsening since the 1952 campaign—I earnestly hope that Mr. Eisenhower will recall these pledges, and that he will sincerely ask himself whether he should not, at this hour of desperate emergency for our farm families, honor the spirit at least of these promises by signing the resolution which would prevent further losses in price and income to farm people.

## NATIONAL SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer for printing as an amendment to the pending highway bill the text of a bill I have previously introduced, entitled "To enable persons in rural areas adversely affected by the proposed location of a highway on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to register their protests over the proposed location."

The amendment is offered in response to suggestions made to me by the National Stockgrowers Association. That association advised me that the present law seemingly excludes them, since it refers only to towns and villages which will be bypassed by the Interstate Highway System or will be bisected by it.

The amendment, which is very simple, merely seeks to afford the people who live in the country the same opportunities to testify that are afforded those who live in towns, to be heard on the locations of sections of the Interstate Highway System. It will enable large stockgrowers or farmers to have ample opportunity to testify relative to roads which are planned to go by or through their property.

I believe there will be little, if any, additional cost entailed for holding the hearings, inasmuch as persons living in rural areas can be invited to appear before meetings held in adjacent villages or towns, and there to present the matters which concern them.

## CONTROL OF BILLBOARDS ON THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on Saturday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], reported to the Senate the new Federal highway bill, S. 3414.

I wish to address myself in particular to the portion of the bill which pertains to the regulation of signboards along the Interstate Highway System.

Mr. President, if I am not mistaken, this will be the first time in the history of the United States that the United States Senate will have debated the entire issue of whether the Federal Government has an equity in protecting roadside scenery and grandeur along highways which qualify for very great Federal benefactions in the form of financial support.

For the information of Senators who may soon have to vote on this question, I should like to detail 10 brief, but important, reasons why the billboard-control incentive provisions proposed by the able junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and me, and adopted by the Committee on Public Works, should remain in the excellent, new Federal-aid highway bill which the committee has ordered reported to the Senate:

First. The new National System of Interstate Highways belongs to the public and the motorists who travel on it, and whose taxes pay for it, and not to any outdoor advertising companies.

Second. In our daily lives, there is all too little contact with America's natural setting and scenic grandeur; and when people do get out of the cities, the countryside should be visible to them, uninterrupted by blatant sales appeals.

Third. This bill does not propose any direct Federal action, but leaves the

choice of action entirely to the individual State governments, and offers assistance to those which wish to act.

Fourth. The interstate highways are 90 percent Federally financed. Is it unreasonable to protect this vast public investment by a slight, additional offer of financial assistance to States which elect, under their own State laws, to safeguard roadside scenery along these new highways?

Fifth. The limited-access nature of these new, transcontinental routes has been accepted by Congress without controversy, although this has denied direct highway frontage to roadside businesses such as motels and restaurants. Should a special exception exist, to permit only one roadside business—the billboard business—to have the privilege of direct access to travelers on the interstate highways?

Sixth. Signboard and other roadside controls can be obtained easily and inexpensively now, as new rights-of-way are being acquired for the interstate highways. If we fail to safeguard the public interest now, we shall leave an impossible burden to those who would wish to do later what we left undone, after a billboard forest has sprung up along the new highway network.

Seventh. Experience with billboard-free routes and areas does not indicate any adverse effect on local establishments which cater to the traveling public or the tourist trade. This bill makes reasonable provisions with respect to informational signs to advise travelers of such facilities located off the highways.

Eighth. Roadside protection has enthusiastic support from millions of persons in all walks of life, with the exception only of those who have a direct financial stake in the potential signboards along the new highways. The billboard industry itself, which deliberately misrepresents this measure in the name of States' rights, consistently fights against regulatory measures at the State level. Mr. President, I repeat that the present bill would assist only States which wish to act.

Ninth. Outdoor signs are effectively regulated in such realms of outstanding scenic grandeur and attraction to tourists as Hawaii, Alaska, and Switzerland.

Tenth. The proposal in the present highway bill is wholly nonpartisan; it was drafted and urged in the committee by 1 Republican Senator and 1 Democratic Senator; at least 8 other Members of Congress of both parties have introduced similar proposed legislation; and such action has been urged by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, several governors, and men and women of both parties in all 48 States.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 12

Mr. President, in these 10 brief paragraphs I have summarized the main reasons why the roadside-control section should remain in the highway bill. At this time I should like to explain in somewhat more detail what this proposal is and how it would meet some of the questions which have been raised about it.

The proposal of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, as further amended in the Committee on Public Works, is contained in section 12 of Senate bill 3414, the overall highway bill reported by the committee. So that Senators may have before them the text of the proposed legislation in question, I ask unanimous consent that section 12 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 12. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374) is amended by renumbering section 122 as section 123 and inserting a new section 122, as follows:

"SEC. 122. Areas adjacent to the Interstate System.

"(a) National policy: To promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investments in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, it is hereby declared to be in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and to improve areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to that system. It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for:

"(1) Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.

"(2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

"(3) Signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

"(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

"(b) Agreements: The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with State highway departments (including such supplementary agreements as may be necessary) to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section with respect to the Interstate System within the State. Any such agreement shall include provisions for regulation and control of the erection and maintenance of advertising signs, displays, and other advertising devices in conformity with the standards established in accordance with subsection (a) and may include, among other things, provisions for preservation of natural beauty, prevention of erosion, landscaping, reforestation, development of viewpoints for scenic attractions that are accessible to the public without charge, and the erection of markers, signs, or plaques, and development of areas in appreciation of site of historical significance. Any such agreement may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the national policy, provide for excluding from application of the national standards segments of the Interstate System which traverse incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control, or which traverse other areas where the land use is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial, or which are built on rights-of-way wholly acquired before July 1, 1956.

"(c) Federal share: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), if an agreement pursuant to this section has been entered into with any State prior to July 1, 1961, the Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System within that State provided for by funds authorized under the provisions of section 108 of this act, to which the national policy and the agreement apply, shall be increased by one-half of 1 percent of the total cost thereof, not including any additional cost that may be incurred in the carrying out of the agreement: *Provided*, That the increase in the Federal share which is payable hereunder shall be paid only from appropriations from moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which such appropriations are hereby authorized.

"(d) Whenever any portion of the Interstate System is located upon or adjacent to any public lands or reservations of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce may make such arrangements and enter into such agreements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands or reservations as may be necessary to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and any such agency is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate fully with the Secretary of Commerce in this connection.

"(e) Whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise or regulate advertising in an area adjacent to the right-of-way of a project on the Interstate System for the purpose of implementing this section, the cost of such acquisition shall be considered as a part of the cost of construction of such project and Federal funds may be used to pay the Federal pro rata share of such cost: *Provided*, That reimbursement to the State shall be made only with respect to that portion of such cost which does not exceed 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way for such project."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, section 12 of the bill adds a new section 122 to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the act under which the new National System of Interstate Highways is to be built.

The section begins by declaring that it is in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control and improve the areas adjacent to the Interstate System, particularly with respect to control of signboards. It states that outdoor advertising signs within 660 feet of the edge of the Interstate System rights-of-way "should be regulated," consistent with certain standards which I shall discuss in a moment.

Note, Mr. President, that there is here no suggestion of any direct Federal prohibition, control, or regulation of billboards or any other roadside structures; there is only a declaration that, in the public interest, there should be regulation and that therefore it would be in the public interest to assist States which wish to provide such regulation. The choice in the matter is left wholly to the States. I wish to emphasize that point very strongly.

The standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce—whose Department includes the Bureau of Public Roads, which administers the Federal-Aid Highway Acts—will expressly recognize that, within this

process of regulation under this act, provisions shall be made for certain classes of signs. Besides, first, the obvious and essential official signs to direct highway traffic, these include three other classes of signs which the committee thought should be provided for in fairness to landowners, and also to off-highway businesses catering specifically to travelers in the particular locality or area where such signs are erected. These are, second, signs advertising the sale or lease of the property on which they are located; third, signs, not larger than 500 square inches, advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located; and, fourth, signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law, and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Actually, Mr. President, I wish to say at this point that I think that as a result of a committee amendment which was adopted in the Senate Committee on Public Works, there is some unnecessary overlap between the third and fourth classes of permitted signs. In our separate views in the committee report, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and I have pointed out that this particular amendment "will confront the States and the Secretary of Commerce with a difficult challenge of administration. We regret that this change will add to the burden of drafting regulations and standards to cover an additional class of signs which should otherwise have been provided for within the fourth class."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am very happy to yield to the cosponsor of the amendment, the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have been perfectly delighted to work on a nonpartisan basis with the able junior Senator from Oregon in fashioning what I feel sure is a perfectly reasonable, logical amendment to deal with the subject of giving to the States of the American Union an incentive to control outdoor advertising along the Interstate Highway System.

I regret that the text of our amendment was altered in one or two respects in the committee.

I wish to ask the able Senator from Oregon a question. When we drafted our amendment, we provided in the fourth exception as follows:

> Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Is it not true that by means of that language, the Senator from Oregon and I, endeavored to indicate a Congressional intent that the States have the right, under their own constitutions and their own State laws, to lay down with respect to those signs such regulations as the States themselves might find necessary in the public interest—that is to say, in the interest of the traveling public? Second, is it not true that was our specific intention in drafting subparagraph (4) of our supplemental views, which have been printed in connection with the committee's report on this bill?

Mr. NEUBERGER. First, Mr. President, I should like to reciprocate the very kind comments of the Senator from California regarding our working together in drafting this amendment. It is always a pleasure to work with the Senator from California, and it is a particularly gratifying pleasure when we are cooperating in a cause which both of us regard as so merited and worthy as this one.

If I am not mistaken, the Senator from California was formerly an official of his State, as I was formerly an official of my State.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I understand that he was a member of the California Legislature during the time when I was a member of the Oregon State Legislature. So it is interesting to know that both of us have served sister States on the Pacific coast, in official capacities.

In our discussions of highway bill amendments which we drafted jointly, I recall very distinctly that we felt great latitude and flexibility should be allowed to the States.

We were aware that regulation of signboards had come under attack as an alleged invasion of States' rights; and I use the word "alleged" advisedly. Again I am going to ask the Senator to check me on this, but it was intended that point 4 in particular would lead legislatures and governors and highway commissions of every State to devise regulations which would provide great flexibility and great latitude, so that signs which would assist the traveling public could be specified in all those States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the Senator completely. Is it not true that by the use of the language which we incorporated in point 4 we intended to make available to each State which entered into such an agreement latitude for each State to determine whether it, the State government itself, would erect signs found to be necessary in the interest of the traveling public, or whether it would authorize private individuals to do that type of labor, under guidelines which the State government would lay down?

Mr. NEUBERGER. In reply to the Senator from California, I wish to reiterate what I said just a few moments before he and I began our discussion. I said, "The choice in the matter is left wholly to the States." It seems to me important that he and I emphasize this point very strongly. Without being provincial, I dare say the Senator from California and I have the privilege of helping represent in the Senate two of the most beautiful and scenic States in the Union.

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed, we do.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We would not want the Federal Government to intrude upon the rights and prerogatives of the officials of the States of California and Oregon to decide just how the scenic grandeur of those two great Pacific seaboard States should be protected. What the Senator from California and I have done is submit to the committee, and now to the Senate, the modus operandi whereby each State government can cooperate with the Department of Commerce, through the Bureau of Public Roads, in regulating signboards along the highway system in a manner specified by the State, and provided only that each State government desires to do so. I do not think we can stress that matter frequently enough. No State has to engage in this billboard regulation whatsoever, if its governor or State legislature is unwilling to do so.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It could not be more of a voluntary arrangement. I dare say, without having knowledge of all of our Federal statutes, which knowledge I certainly lack, that this arrangement is more voluntary, in its purely cooperative arrangement between the States and the Federal Government, than 9 out of 10 arrangements whereby the Federal Government and the States work together in various programs which the Federal Government finances in whole or in part. Would not the Senator from California say that is a reasonably accurate statement?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do, and I think every intention in which we indulged was to give the States maximum latitude in applying a national policy, which, as the Senator has suggested, has been endorsed by outstanding citizens from every State of the Union, and certainly from both political parties.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad the Senator from California brought out that particular point. I do not think there is any issue that has come before this session of Congress which is more strictly and wholly nonpartisan.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Those who testified in behalf of the general policy which the Senator from California and I are supporting came from every avenue of life, from every possible stratum of society, and I think from every geographical region of our Nation. As I pointed out earlier, the idea of billboard regulation has been supported by President Eisenhower, and only 2 days ago I received a letter from the leader of the political party of which I am a member, the illustrious former Governor of Illinois, Adlai E. Stevenson, in which he took generally the same position. I think this in particular represents an effort of average people all over the United States. They may not be as vocal as what is known euphemistically as the billboard lobby, but I daresay 9 out of 10 of the American people who drive on the highways, and whose taxes pay for the highways, want to be able to look at the American countryside, whether it be in California, Oregon, or New Hampshire, without encountering a picket of signboards along the highways which they have financed and paid for.

Mr. KUCHEL. I heartily agree with what the Senator has said. I thank him for developing the intention of those who drafted the amendment which we gladly offered in committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. I believe I can safely say that if the Senator from California and I had not been able to get together successfully and harmoniously, on a nonpartisan basis, the provision before the Senate today would not have been adopted by the Senate Public Works Committee. I think the Senator from California deserves great credit for modifying, or perhaps altering to some degree, the position he took last year. I think it is always the highest caliber of statesmanship when a person is willing to take a fresh look at a question and modify his view. I hope it is, because I changed my views with respect to postal rates, after taking a fresh look and sitting in the postal rate subcommittee. So I salute him for the openmindedness with which the Senator from California encountered this whole problem, and for the leadership he has demonstrated.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much. I look forward to vigorously pressing the amendment which the committee adopted, as we enter the debate in the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It will be a great source of strength to have the Senator from California at my side, because he has technical knowledge in this respect, from a legal standpoint, which I lack. I want to say to him that as we get into the issue I shall look to him not only for assistance, but for leadership and guidance.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from California.

In any case, the point is that the standards of regulation to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce under this bill must provide for certain types of signs, consistent with those standards, which are of real informative value to the highway traveler specifically in the general area where he is traveling. What the States may do further to restrict signs under their own laws, beyond this bill, is of course wholly their own affair. As I shall continue to point out, this bill does not limit State freedom of action. But if State law authorizes the kinds of signs mentioned in the third and fourth classes of subsection (a), the standards promulgated by the Secretary may only contain reasonable regulation of them, not total prohibition.

I might say at this point, Mr. President, that I have no idea what standards the Secretary may promulgate as to the nature and shape of these permissible signs, their frequency, their location, their appearance in the setting in which they are to be placed, and so forth. I know that the professional personnel of various State highway departments have had much experience along these lines which no doubt will enter into the preparation of these standards. After all, the whole program is entirely dependent upon its acceptability for State action by a meaningful number of States. I only wish to emphasize, both to the proponents of effective controls and to those who are sincerely concerned about a possibly unjust impact of this bill, that we must proceed on the assumption that those charged with the administration of this program will act in a spirit of wanting it make it work. That is an essential assumption for any program, not only this program, and it is an absolute sine qua non for one like this that depends on the free and voluntary action of independent States.

AGREEMENTS WITH SEPARATE STATES

Subsection (b) of section 12 authorizes the agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and the highway departments of those States wishing to enter into such agreements, which will spell out the provisions for applying the policy standards of subsection (a) to the interstate highways within each particular State.

Let me stress that, beyond having to meet the standards of billboard regulation, these agreements may also include provisions for affirmative action to improve the appearance of the roadsides. This may include planting of trees and shrubs, general landscaping, the construction of viewpoints where motorists may leave the main highway surface to enjoy the scenery, roadside rest and picnic areas, historical markers, and so forth. I believe it was Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, who recently pointed out that in building these new limited-access interstate roads, largely on new rights-of-way, the Nation has a unique opportunity to develop many thousands of miles of parkways across our country—an opportunity, Mr. President, which will not be available to the American people again in this century. In my view, this goal of making the best possible use of that unique opportunity can, and should be, one of the most worthwhile aspects of the agreements contemplated under this section.

Mr. President, not all of the 41,000 miles of the Interstate System will cross open country or attractive populated areas. Much of it will be through areas which are already wholly industrial or commercial in character. Many miles will traverse incorporated cities with home rule and their own zoning codes and land-use regulations. Some of it will be on existing rights-of-way, incorporating stretches of highway which already approximated the construction standards for the Interstate System when the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 was enacted. To show the fallacy of those who believe that we are adopting an unreasonable, unrealistic, purist approach to this question of roadside control, let me point out that section 12 (b) expressly recognizes that the agreements with the States may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, and consistent with the public policy of this bill, exclude any such segments of the Interstate System within a State.

Again, flexibility for reasonable administration has been the keynote of drafting this provision, to which the junior Senator from California in particular has devoted much time and thought.

Mr. President, at this point I again want to emphasize the great contribution which the junior Senator from California has made to the drafting of an amendment which leaves extreme latitude to the States. The Senator emphasized to me the desirability of permitting zones of commercial and industrial areas contiguous to any municipality or incorporated town. After we discussed the matter thoroughly with our respective staffs, we included the provision in the amendment which is before the Senate. I stress that, because I wish to show that both the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and I have had in mind over and over again not only the authority and prerogatives of the States, but the authority and prerogatives of municipalities within those States, where industrial and commercial zones are located which might parallel the new interstate highways.

The powers of local government differ from State to State. Within any given State, some municipalities may wish to use their powers to join in bringing their segments of the interstate highways within the agreements, others may not. The discretion of the Secretary is surely adequate to prevent abuse of the possible exclusions. As I stated earlier, since the agreements are wholly voluntary, the whole proposal is drafted on the assumption that reasonable men are going to use their best efforts and judgment to make it work. On this assumption, I am completely confident that the plan of this bill can and will work easily and well, taking full account of local situations peculiar to each separate State.

INCREASED FEDERAL SHARE FOR INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS IN PARTICIPATING STATES

Mr. President, subsection (c) of section 12 provides that with respect to the projects on the Interstate Highway System to which the policy standards of this bill are made applicable by a State, under the kind of agreement I have just described, that State will be entitled to an extra one-half percent Federal share of the project cost, beyond the 90 percent now paid from Federal funds. Surely that is a modest enough incentive to offer to any State which, on its own initiative, acts to make and preserve its parts of the National System of Interstate Highways attractive for the travelers of the whole Nation. My original bill, S. 963, provided a bonus of three-fourths percent; that of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], 1 percent. The Committee on Public Works reduced this to one-half percent, partly because of the additional provisions of subsection (e). I regretted that this one-half percent incentive payment to States has been made payable from funds appropriated for the purpose, not from the special highway trust fund, because I thought it a legitimate and reasonable element of the total national investment in the Interstate System.

I wish to state here, since the junior Senator from California is present in the Chamber, that both he and I felt the incentive payments should come from the trust fund rather than from separately appropriated funds, as a majority of the Committee on Public

Works of the Senate finally voted before the bill was reported to the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I certainly share the feelings of the Senator from Oregon on that point. Mr. President, we are embarked upon a multi-billion-dollar, 41,000-mile highway program. The Federal Government has set down the standards under which the high-speed limited-access freeway across the Nation will be built. Certainly as a part of the construction, since we are paying from the Federal Treasury 90 percent of the cost, the Senator from Oregon is completely correct in believing that this modest amount of money to be paid to the States as an incentive ought to come from the trust fund. I regret that that part of our amendment was changed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad the Senator from California and I are in agreement on this particular fact. I think he also would concur in the statement that this was one of the concessions which he and I were reluctant to accept, but which we finally went along with in order to get the basic principle and policy before the United States Senate for action on the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct. I joined with my colleague from Oregon, Mr. President, in accepting that by way of a concession, because in the last analysis when the Senate votes it will be on the basic question, Does the Senate of the United States believe that the American people should take an interest in protecting the scenery through which the 41,000-mile system is to be constructed?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Once the basic policy is written into Federal law, later Congresses can perfect and improve the law, as has been done with almost every act adopted since this country was founded.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. However, Mr. President, the change which was made by the committee should at least silence those critics of the bill who would claim that this modest one-half of 1 percent increase in the Federal contribution to project costs in participating States would slow down construction of the National System of Interstate Highways. As the bill now stands, the availability of trust fund money for road construction would not be in any way affected by the one-half of 1 percent incentive provision. That one-half of 1 percent is authorized to be appropriated by the Congress and of course, I have no doubt whatever that it will be appropriated as States become entitled to it by their participation under this act.

I shall only mention, at this point, subsection (d) of section 12, which provides for application of the national policy to lands adjacent to the Interstate System which are public lands or reservations of the United States itself.

Finally, subsection (e) offers the States an important tool to aid them to carry out the provisions of this act, if they should desire to do so. Very simply, this subsection permits the inclusion in a State's right-of-way acquisition costs—for which the State receives 90 percent Federal reimbursement—of up to 5 percent additional costs incurred in acquiring control over advertising rights along the segments of the new Interstate Highways within its borders that are to be covered in that State's agreement.

This provision, I submit, should silence those critics of this bill who have claimed that Congress will, in effect, force States to deprive landowners along the new highways of a valuable right and give nothing in return. Personally, Mr. President, I have always thought this to be an extremely specious argument. There are no valuable billboard rights, as such, in any land, apart from the highway that may cross it. The highway itself creates the opportunity and the value. The highway delivers to the land the captive audience of motorists which are the billboards' only targets. If there is no highway, the alleged valuable advertising rights will be about as valuable as a billboard on the moon—on the side that faces permanently away from the earth.

Rather than speak of a deprivation of valuable rights, Mr. President, let us frankly face the fact that the new Interstate Highway System would offer the outdoor advertising industry an immense bonanza, an absolutely unparalleled, historic gift at the cost of the Federal taxpayers that would overshadow Federal benefits to any industry since the land grants to the railroads. And I might add that the billboards do not exactly earn this benefaction by opening up our continent to travelers and tonnage, as the railroads did.

REIMBURSEMENT OF LANDOWNERS PERMITTED

Nevertheless, it is argued in opposition to this bill that an outright regulation of roadside signboards by the States, under their so-called police power, will deprive farmers and other landowners of a valuable assets—earned or not—which would otherwise result from the construction of the highway, and that Congress should not stimulate such action by any State. Let us be clear then that under this bill, under subsection (e) of section 12, Congress will not do so.

As in other respects, this bill leaves the individual States the utmost freedom of choice in this regard. A State or its subdivisions may use police powers to protect all or part of its interstate highways and qualify for the one-half percent additional Federal share of project costs under this bill. A State may equally qualify without using police power, by acquiring the right to control roadside signs and reimbursing the landowner. If it chooses the latter course, the costs will be recognized as a legitimate cost for 90 percent Federal reimbursement, up to a limit of 5 percent of the total cost of right-of-way acquisition for the project in question. This bill expresses no preference in the manner. It holds neither a carrot nor a stick over the head of any State in making this particular choice of means. If ever there were a program that was tailored to letting States choose whether and how to carry out a public policy in their own way, and to assist them to do it, this is it, Mr. President.

NO SUBSTANTIAL COSTS INVOLVED

I might add just a comment about the possible cost involved in the acquisition of billboard control by the States under subsection (e), which I have just explained. A word of caution is in order, before various wild, hypothetical estimates are thrown into the debate by opponents of this bill concerning alleged diversion of highway construction funds into roadside protection measures by the States.

There are far too many unpredictable factors involved to permit any kind of an estimate except to indicate a ceiling beyond which costs would not go. Let me list a few. We cannot know which States will choose to act at all. We cannot know which of those that do act will use police powers, and which will wholly or in part pay to acquire the right to control roadside billboards. We cannot know the right-of-way acquisition costs for the highway segments to come under State roadside regulation, and to which the 5 percent permissible extra cost would apply.

Does subsection (e) therefore make an unlimited "grab bag" of the highway trust funds from which States might enrich landowners along the interstate highway rights-of-way? Certainly and definitely not.

The heavy right-of-way acquisition costs are in cities and other heavily populated, commercial, or industrial areas. These, as I have said, may be eliminated from the agreements with the States. Obviously, for example, it would not make sense for a State to purchase billboard-control rights out to 660 feet from both edges of a highway right-of-way that passes between the high, narrow walls of warehouses, or factories of an urban industrial area.

Out in the open country, on the other hand, let us assume that right-of-way acquisition constitutes, in a typical instance, 10 or 15 percent of the total project construction cost. I believe that in the testimony before our committee Mr. Bertram Tallamy, the Federal Highway Administrator, estimated something like 13 percent.

I have already explained that the additional cost of also acquiring signboard control rights on adjoining land should be very low, because these have actually no value until the highways are there to deliver the motorists, so to speak, into the arms of the billboard advertiser. A fair price would be determined under State law, not this act. But in any case, the bill places a limit of 5 percent on additional costs for which Federal reimbursement may be claimed. A 5-percent maximum on even 20 percent right-of-way acquisition costs means a maximum 1-percent increase in project costs that might be added to reimbursable costs. Even if acquisition costs were to run as high as 40 percent in isolated instances, project costs could not grow more than 2 percent by use of subsection (e). Mr. President, these project costs fluctuate far more from month to month,

with changes in the price levels of materials and so forth, than this tiny fraction which represents the maximum cost increase that might be involved under this bill.

CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES VERSUS BILLBOARD PROFITS

Mr. President, this completes my description of section 12 and how it proposes to aid States to control and protect the roadsides along the National System of Interstate Highways in the interest of and for the enjoyment of the travelers on these new highways. I would like now to address myself briefly to the overall policy question for which section 12 was drafted, and which the Congress must now decide.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to ask the Senator if any evidence was brought out at the hearing which would indicate that the inducements provided in the bill would be attractive to the States, and would encourage the States to carry out the national policy regarding roadside signs and billboards which the Senator has described.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To begin with, I wish to emphasize that there appeared before our committee, either in person or by resolution or in writing, literally thousands of citizens. Those people spoke for themselves, or they represented great organizations in every State, including the State of the Senator from Kentucky and my own State.

They represented the American Automobile Association, many conservation groups, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and an almost unlimited number of conservation and outdoor organizations, such as the Audubon Society, the National Wildlife Federation, and so forth.

It seemed to me, sitting at the committee table and listening to those people, that if this amendment were adopted, those interested in scenic and roadside protection in every State could then go to the governors and legislatures in the various States—as is their right—and say, "The Federal Government has provided reasonable machinery. It has provided a framework for you to help in protecting the countryside and the scenery along the Interstate Highway System in our State. We urge you to take this incentive offered by the Federal Government and to cooperate with the Bureau of Public Roads in protecting our highways from the blight of signboards."

To my knowledge, no governor except Averell Harriman came before our committee and testified particularly in favor of the proposed legislation now before us; but all the people who came from the great groups said, "Give us this legislation, so that we can ask our States to cooperate with the Federal Government to take this incentive, use this machinery, and to protect our roadsides."

Mr. COOPER. Then is it the Senator's idea that if the bill is passed—and I hope it will be passed with the amendment which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California are sponsoring—it should provide a helpful way for public opinion to be expressed, and to be recognized by the legislatures and authorities of the States, in carrying out the national policy enunciated in the proposed amendment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. If I am not mistaken—and the Senator from Kentucky is far more experienced in legislative matters than I am—practically all cooperative programs between the Federal Government and the States work in that way. The Federal Government provides matching funds to assist in programs for aid to dependent children, for aid to the blind, for aid in cleaning up rivers, sewage control systems, and so forth. The Federal Government does not say to any State, "You must take this money to assist your blind people," or "you must take this money to end pollution in your rivers." The Federal Government says, "These funds will be available if you cooperate in a certain way."

Actually, under the bill proposed by the Senator from California and myself, there probably would be less compulsion than there is under other programs, because action is left entirely up to the States. The point I wish to emphasize is this: It was apparent, after prolonged hearings which were held under the able chairmanship and leadership of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that there are in every State of the Union thousands of men and women who do not want billboards cluttering the interstate highways. They had gone to their State legislatures. In most of the State legislatures they had encountered the billboard lobby, which had seen to it that the mildest kind of State regulation usually was defeated. Then they came to the Federal Government and encountered the cry of "States rights" from the same people who had previously opposed State regulation of billboards.

I can speak from a background of some experience in this field. My wife and I, as members of the Oregon State Legislature, tried to bring about the enactment of billboard regulation laws in the State of Oregon, which the billboard lobby helped to defeat. We know that there are those who want to be able to say, "Uncle Sam, the United States Government, has provided an incentive. Please use it and keep our highway scenery protected."

Mr. COOPER. I believe that the junior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from California have made a valuable contribution to the national welfare in leading the fight for more than a year, to preserve the beauty of our highways.

When the bill is passed, as it undoubtedly will be, setting forth, a national policy with respect to the beauty of the countryside along our roads, it would indeed be a shame if the States did not cooperate to carry out the national policy. I believe the States will cooperate, and will welcome the opportunity to make the new highways more attractive to visitors.

I think the States will appreciate the value of preserving, both for travelers and people close to home, a true and natural picture of the local countryside and of the areas these roads will serve. For one of the glories of this country is the varied scene brought to view in driving along our national highways, which can always be attractive and instructive, and which ought to be protected. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California have performed a great service by their leadership in this field.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Kentucky is one of the most thoughtful and influential Members of the Senate. I know that I speak also for the Senator from California when I say how much we value and appreciate his support.

I wish to concur especially in one point the Senator has made, namely, that it would be a genuine shame if this were not done. We are almost at the 11th hour when this can be done. As we stand herein the Senate today, engineers with transits and plumblines are out across the face of this great land of ours, laying out rights-of-way for the Interstate Highway System. It will be the greatest highway network ever to be constructed in any nation on the earth. It will be worthy of the engineering genius and the constructive capacity of America.

Unless we provide machinery and methods very soon for the States to protect the scenery along the highways, there will spring up a billboard jungle which will acquire what is known as grandfather rights. Then it may be too late.

Therefore I very much value the counsel of the Senator from Kentucky in the points that he made. It would truly be a disaster if we did not allow the motorists, who are going to pay for these highways, to see the American countryside, rather than a picketfence of signboards.

Mr. COOPER. I might say that the only letters I received from my State opposing the provisions to protect scenic beauty along the roads, which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California have written into this bill, have come from those who are commercially interested in billboards.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I could not agree more with what the Senator has said. The billboard lobby wants to use our highways, paid for by the American public, as a conduit or funnel along which they can plaster their signboards. The people who will pay to make the signboards of value are the people who pay the fuel taxes and the automobile excise taxes, which go into the roadway trust fund. Without the highways, none of the billboards would be worth a continental dollar.

On earlier occasions in my efforts toward billboard control during three sessions of Congress, I have spelled out at greater length the true conservation aspects which are inhehent in our giving a means of protection for the roadsides of the Nation's new cross-country travel arteries. I cannot believe it is necessary to say more than a very few words about this today. I cannot believe that there can be any real question as to how the travelers themselves would prefer to see their highways—with unlimited billboards, or with effective billboard regulation, limited to the kinds of controlled signs of specific interest to travelers that

under this bill may be permitted under conditions and in locations specified by the agreements between the States and the Secretary of Commerce. To anyone who has traveled both kinds of roads—for example, from Washington, D. C., to Baltimore by the old U. S. 1 and by the new Washington-Baltimore Parkway—there can be no question as to what the great traveling public would prefer. The question is only whether we, in the Congress, are going to help them to obtain what they would prefer, or whether instead we are going to help the billboard industry to obtain what they want out of the estimated $40 billion public investment in the 41,000 miles of the new Interstate System.

For let there be no mistake about the fact that, uncontrolled, the roadsides along these magnificent new highways will be the greatest bananza the billboard industry has ever enjoyed at the cost of the American motorist and taxpayer. It is worthwhile to pause, to recall that the rise of signboard advertising in the open country has been inevitably and closely linked with the growth of our country's highway network itself. Both are, of course, the result of the development of our present automotive culture which mushroomed soon after the First World War. It was not long thereafter, also, that the States began to use gasoline taxes as the most important single source of the funds with which to build the tremendous web of paved roads which the millions of mass-produced new cars required. I believe my own State of Oregon was the first State to initiate the gas tax. Thus for decades the motorist has in large measure paid for America's roads. In a very direct way, they are his roads.

Certainly they do not belong to the billboard industry. But that industry has sprung up and mushroomed to its present giant size in step with the growth of automobile travel, taking advantage of the roads built for the motorist with his taxes to force its sales messages to his attention from the adjoining landscape.

I think the claims of outdoor advertising companies, that proponents of section 12 are threatening them with utter destruction and ruin, should be put in proper perspective. For example, Changing Times, the W. M. Kiplinger magazine of May 1957, reported "If you think you see more billboards than ever on the highways, you are right. Never have there been so many of the huge ad displays built and planned. Advertisers will spend over $200 million on them this year—compared with a mere $44,700,000 back in 1940." Keep in mind that this growth in billboard construction, from 1940 up to and including 1957, has occurred before any of the new interstate highways have been built. The 41,000 miles of these highways—and of course not all of them would even be controlled under this bill—constitute less than 3 percent of the approximately 1,500,000 miles of surfaced public roads and highways in our country. Today these other highways are also being built, extended, and improved at a tremendous rate, and have offered an opportunity for growth to the billboard industry, at public expense, that many other industries and businesses in our country might well envy. It is absurd to suggest that the public now owes to the outdoor advertising industry the additional opportunity of making billboard alleys of the new limited-access superhighways, for the sake of saving the industry from collapse.

Mr. President, no doubt Members of the Senate have in the past few days, since section 12 was accepted by the Committee on Public Works, received many messages of protest from persons who have a direct stake in the outdoor advertising industry in their own States. This is the question and suggestion to which the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] referred a few minutes ago. People in this business certainly have a constitutional right to "petition for the redress of grievances" as have any other citizens. But keep in mind that, as organized business groups which may be directly and financially affected by legislation, the outdoor advertisers themselves are in a far better position to bring their desires to our attention rapidly than is the great mass of the public, which has no such financial interest.

However, through such nonprofit, voluntary associations as exist, for example, in the conservation field, many people have made their wishes in this matter known to us. Let me list some of the organizations that are known to me to have endorsed billboard regulation and other measures of improvement for the new highways. Most directly interested, of course, have been two national organizations specifically concerned with roads and roadsides—the American Automobile Association, representing America's motorists organized in the separate State motor clubs, and the National Roadside Committee, representing leaders of the roadside councils and other interests organized at both the national and State levels. Other national organizations supporting Congressional action for roadside control include the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Garden Club of America, and also the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the National Park Association, the National Audubon Society, the Wilderness Society, the American Nature Association, the American Association of Nurserymen, and the American Planning and Civic Association.

From my own State of Oregon I have received endorsements for this proposal from organizations which may be representative of similar groups that may exist in other States—for example, the Oregon State Motor Association; the Oregon Roadside Council; the Oregon Federation of Garden Clubs; the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs whose headquarters are in Eugene; the Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs; the Oregon Society of Landscape Architects; the Mazamas and the Obsidians, both of them outdoor clubs; the Oregon Association of Nurserymen; and others. I might mention at this point that I have also received numerous messages from similar organizations in many other States, which I shall not list here, as I trust they have also communicated directly with their own Senators.

As another indication of the nationwide public interest in Congressional action on the billboard control measure which now appears as section 12 of the highway bill, let me read a list of only a portion of the newspapers in this country which have editorially endorsed such a measure. These include such nationally known newspapers as the New York Times; the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; the Milwaukee Journal; Baltimore Sun; all three of Washington's newspapers—the Star, Post and Times Herald, and the Daily News; Christian Science Monitor; the Denver Post; and the Oregonian.

The list includes from the Eastern States, New York World Telegram; Worcester, Mass., Telegram; Courier-Post, Camden, N. J.; the Evening News, Harrisburg, Pa.; Pittsburgh Post-Gazette; the Philadelphia Inquirer; the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa.; Watertown, N. Y., Daily News; Daily News, Greensboro, N. C.; New York Post.

It includes from the Midwest and West, the St. Louis Globe; Capital Times, Madison, Wis.; Toledo Blade; St. Paul Press; Capital Times, Rockford, Ill.; Texarkana Gazette; Detroit News; Sheboygan, Wis., Press; Colorado Springs Free Press; and the Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz.

In Oregon billboard control has been editorially endorsed by the Portland Oregonian, Oregon Journal, Pendleton East-Oregonian, Astorian Daily Budget, Medford Mail Tribune, Eugene Register Guard, the Oregon Statesman, Salem, and many others.

Mr. President, let me read from the American Issue, the national monthly publication of the National Temperance League for November 1957, commenting on the excellent editorials of the Washington Post and Times Herald supporting a billboard control measure.

> Those who can join in with the Washington Post campaign to end the billboard disgrace should also remember that the biggest user of highway billboards is the liquor traffic. The beer, wine, and whisky people will not surrender gracefully to losing their roadside advertising space, especially when four out of every 10 billboards are theirs. The campaign to end the billboard disgrace is commendable. Let us hope that Congress will take some positive action to end it in the coming session.

I might point out that of the top 24 national users of outdoor advertising, each of which spent $1 million a year or more on billboards in 1956, nine were either distilleries or breweries.

Finally, Mr. President, I point out that this is a wholly nonpartisan issue, one which has the support of leaders of both parties. Bills similar to section 12 were introduced by 10 members of both Houses of Congress, representing both parties. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, I understand, favors Congressional action, and Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks spoke for the administration in favor of such action before our committee.

I am particularly proud, personally, of a message from Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, President Eisenhower's Democratic opponent in his two campaigns for the

Presidency. Adlai Stevenson has just written me:

CHICAGO, *March 19, 1958.*

DEAR DICK: Lest there be any misunderstanding as to my position, I want to make it emphatically clear that I support wholeheartedly your billboard control amendment to the highway bill.

My reason for supporting this amendment is that I consider it to be not only in the public interest, but absolutely essential to preserving for American motorists their vast investment in the new Federal Interstate Highway System.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ADLAI.

I digress to call attention to the significance of the fact that the two preeminent leaders in American public life both favor signboard regulation as proposed in the amendment sponsored by the junior Senator from California and myself. Although we are not committing them to crossing every "i" and dotting every "t," as we are committed, nevertheless the general policy of billboard regulation is supported by Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and by former Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, who was Mr. Eisenhower's Democratic opponent in the two most recent national elections. I believe this circumstance should be of significance and interest to all Senators.

I might add, Mr. President, that Governor Stevenson's position is of a piece with his whole consistent record in favor of sound policies of conservation, of preserving natural values as an essential element of the humane life in the whirlpools of urban and industrial commercialization in which our daily lives are increasingly caught up.

Mr. President, I conclude my speech on that point. Industry opponents of the signboard control measures I have sponsored repeatedly counter with the claim that industry has a policy of not interfering with particularly beautiful views or spectacular scenery. They speak of the ordinary range lands, prairies, forests, and farmlands through which much of the cross-country highway system will pass as if, because they lack the distinction of special grandeur or unusualness, such roadside areas might as well be covered up by the well-built, neatly lettered, brightly colored billboard structures of which the industry boasts.

That misses the point. Not all of America is uniformly beautiful and spectacular and blessed with scenic grandeur of mountains and forests and waterfalls.

Not all of America, for example, has the extraordinary scenery which can be viewed along the California and Oregon seacoast, where United States Highway 101 clings like a lariat, but all of America has exceptional qualities of different distinctions—distinctions which, in my opinion, should not be, willy-nilly, plastered with signboards, particularly along roads for which the motorists themselves have paid, and which they have a right to enjoy free of the billboard blight. There are wheatfields and handsome farms, and there are also poor, ramshackle farms and tenant shacks and even junk yards along the roads. But this is all our country, and when we see the roadsides, we may see our country as it exists. The point is that none of these roadside views is there specifically to force itself on our attention. None of it is there specifically to try to sell us anything. Day in and day out, every American is assailed by advertising, whether it be the hard sell or the soft sell. Would it be such a sacrifice to let him escape, even briefly, when he takes to the open road to travel across his country—the country which, fields and streams and mountains and farms and shacks and all, we have learned to describe as "America the Beautiful"?

I think the sellers of the Nation's goods can afford Americans this brief respite from salesmanship, without danger that the American economy will forever collapse. In this balancing of, on the one hand, the values of economic self-interest and, on the other, a noneconomic interest in values not measureable in money, let us for once vote to preserve the latter.

That is why I urge that section 12, sponsored jointly by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, be retained in the highway bill now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a number of telegrams and letters which I have received from representative citizens in my own State of Oregon, urging Congressional action to provide cooperative agreements with the States to control and regulate the signboards along the Interstate Highway System.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 21, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Please correct my telegram to read support billboard amendment.

BARBARA ELLIOTT DAVIES.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Strongly support your billboard amendment.

McCALL OIL CO.

---

DALLAS, TEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Keep billboard amendment and oppose efforts to weaken it. The people are incensed over such use of our new highway system. Let's keep America beautiful now and forever. We do not want billboards.

Mrs. DEWITT RAY.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Congratulations on your conservation work. Keep your billboard amendment in highway bill.

Mrs. HAROLD B. GILL.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Congratulations, your effort billboard amendment.

EDITH IRELAND.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Appreciate your keeping billboard amendment A in highway bill.

Mrs. HERBERT A. TEMPLETON.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Best of luck for your amendment to highway billboard bill. Important to keep highway free of all billboards. We feel very strongly on this issue and sincerely hope you will bend every effort.

MARION G. ANDERSON.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Heartily support your stand on billboard amendment.

Mrs. THEODORE A. ADAMS.

---

OSWEGO, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Congratulations on your efforts to keep billboard amendment in highway bill.

ANN and LAWRENCE SHAW.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Congratulating your fine effort on billboard amendment.

NORMA S. KUHN.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Oregon people want billboard legislation. Will welcome passage amendment. Congratulations.

Mrs. W. H. CROWELL.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Hoping your efforts concerning billboard amendment are successful.

Mrs. A. E. BERTHA McINTOSH.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Everyone supports your efforts to keep billboard amendment in highway bill.

Mrs. JOYLE DAHL.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 21, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Strongly urge continue support keeping billboard amendment highway bill.

Mrs. DAN MARLARKEY, Jr.

---

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1958.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Strongly urge your continued support keeping billboard amendment in highway bill.

Mrs. HENRY F. CABELL.

---

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF PORTLAND,
*Portland, Oreg., March 18, 1958.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have read with much interest the amendment proposed by Senator KUCHEL and you to section 122 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. I think you have done a good job in putting together the content of this amendment, and I hope you and your associate will succeed in having it grafted onto the main highway act.

Kind regards.

Yours truly,

E. B. MacNAUGHTON.

OREGON ROADSIDE COUNCIL,
*Portland, Oreg., March 20, 1958.*
EDITOR, BETTER ROADS,
*Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR SIR: In your issue of October 1957, there is a letter signed by Frank Blake which carries misstatements which I think should be corrected. Mr. Blake is director of public relations of the Outdoor Advertising Association of America. He states, "We have not the slightest desire or intention of exploiting the open country, nor the scenic areas alongside the new Interstate Highway System, and we operate under a strict code of practices that would prevent such action on our part." What are the facts? Billboards put up by members of his association blight the open country and scenic areas alongside the new interstate system in many, many places over the country.

As an example of the error in the claim of the outdoor advertisers and their disregard of the wishes of the majority of people, I enclose a photograph of a section of the New Portland (Oreg.)-Salem Freeway, a part of the interstate system, new U. S. No. 5, with four billboards in sight. This highway traverses the open country of the lovely Willamette Valley with views of the snowcapped Cascade Range—Mt. Hood, Mt. Jefferson, etc. Yet the billboards shown in the picture were recently erected by members of the Outdoor Advertising Association of America.

I hope you can use this photo and, perhaps, this letter (in part) in your columns.

Very truly yours,

THORNTON T. MUNGER,
*Vice President.*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield for a brief comment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I congratulate the able Senator from Oregon on a very clear expression of the intention for which the billboard amendment was drafted, and a very clear demonstration of what he believes—a belief in which I am pleased to share completely—can be accomplished if the amendment remains in the Senate bill and continues to be a part of the vehicle to which it is now attached, the Highway Act of 1958.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I particularly appreciate the generous comments of the Senator from California, because without his cooperation it is my feeling that we would not have this proposal in the Senate today. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their indulgence, and I yield the floor.

---

## AMENDMENT OF SOIL BANK ACT, RELATING TO COMPLIANCE WITH CORN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That section 114 of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this section—(1) no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under an acreage reserve contract for 1958 by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for corn if the county in which such farm is located is included in the commercial corn-producing area for the first time in 1958; (2) no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under an acreage reserve contract for any year subsequent to 1958 or a conservation reserve contract by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for corn if such contract was entered into prior to January 1 of the first year for which the county is included in the commercial corn-producing area: *Provided*, That the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply only to a farm for which an 'old farm' corn allotment is established for such first year. For purposes of this provision, a contract which has been terminated by the producer under the program regulations by reason of the fact that the county in which the farm is located was included in the commercial corn-producing area for the first time in 1958, and which is reinstated, shall be deemed to have been entered into as of the original date of execution of such contract."

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that the Senate amendment does not prevail in its entirety, but that the two things which the Senate set out to do are accomplished under the conference substitute.

The first was to make certain that the persons in the 38 counties of the Nation which have become this year commercial corn counties for the first time, and who had last year or the year before signed conservation reserve agreements, were not penalized because their counties had come into the classification of commercial corn counties, and thereby forced to accept corn allotments or forgo their Soil Bank payments which neither they nor the Government had in mind at the time the conservation reserve agreements were entered into. The programs to that effect were completely approved by the Department of Agriculture.

The second thing which was sought to be accomplished was to give similar protection to those who had signed acreage reserve agreements under the Soil Bank prior to January 1, 1958, which affected their winter-wheat plantings last fall. They were entitled equally to the protection which I have just stated. Those two objectives are carried out by the substitute.

The third objective which is added in the substitute is one with which the Senate conferees were not in full accord, but which, apparently, had to be granted in order to get a bill. That was the inclusion of an arrangement making the same provision apply to acreage reserve contracts for this year—1958—alone, whether they were signed since the beginning of the year or not.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short statement I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND—DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 10843 AND THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE THEREFOR

The conference substitute differs from the Senate amendment to H. R. 10843 in that it extends its provisions to all 1958 acreage reserve contracts in the 38 counties first included in 1958 in the commercial corn-producing area. As related to acreage reserve contracts the Senate amendment covered only those 1958 contracts executed prior to January 1, 1958, which would have meant that only winter wheat acreage reserve contracts entered into last fall would have been covered.

The House bill differed from the Senate amendment in two respects in the case of acreage reserve contracts. The House bill covered all 1958 acreage reserve contracts in the 38 new counties, but did not apply to acreage reserve contracts for any subsequent year. The Senate amendment applied only to acreage reserve contracts executed prior to January 1, and would be applicable to 1959 acreage reserve contracts if there should be an acreage reserve program for 1959.

The conference substitute adopts the House provision with respect to covering all 1958 acreage reserve contracts and the Senate provision with respect to covering 1959 acreage reserve contracts.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided exemption from the requirement of cross-compliance with corn acreage allotments for all conservation reserve contracts entered into prior to January 1 of the first year in which the county was included in the commercial corn area. This exemption is a permanent one and is retained in the conference substitute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the conference report was unanimously approved and signed by the Senate conferees, and was approved and signed by four of the five House conferees.

I move that the conference report be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

## FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, across the several States of the Nation there are hundreds of thousands of miles, perhaps literally millions of miles, of city streets, county roads, State highways, and other thoroughfares of various types, built by all levels of government, from the smallest type of local, public agency to the Government of the United States.

For many years it has been the policy of the Federal Government to provide to the several States an incentive to construct certain types of thoroughfares within the jurisdiction of each State. The participation by the Federal Government has been financial, although in addition the Congress has laid down for the Federal Bureau of Public Roads certain standards and guidelines by which the Bureau should determine the availability of Federal moneys to any participating State.

Two years ago the Congress of the United States debated the question of whether the Federal Government should participate—and, if so, to what extent—in the construction of a great Interstate Highway System, not only important to the needs of the civilian economy of the country, but also important to the defense of the American people. In the debate in the Senate and in the debate in the House of Representatives, the tragic toll of dead and maimed, each year, as a result of highway accidents was iterated and reiterated. It was also in the interest of safety of the American traveling public that the Congress debated the problem involved in the possible construction of a great, new system of high-speed arterial highways, all of limited access, all built to specifications of the highest standards, which in the end would ribbon the United States from north to south and from east to west.

Ultimately the Congress passed the interstate and defense highway law under which the Federal Treasury would underwrite 90 percent of the cost of construction. The bill also provided that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads would carefully sit in judgment as to the high standards which each State must follow in order to obtain nine-tenths of the cost of constructing the system within its borders.

In the intervening months, construction across the country has progressed; but for many reasons it has not progressed with the rapidity which was envisioned at the time when the bill was passed.

Thus, as the Senate deliberates this week on proposed legislation to get the 13-year Interstate Highway System construction program back on the track, the Senate has also—two years after the original law was passed—still to face up to a fundamental problem, as the pending bill faces up to it now. That is simply whether the American people have the right to look forward to a great new highway system, unspoiled by indiscriminate outdoor advertising. I say the American people have that right and that Congress has a duty to perform in this field.

I wish to say in all frankness that last August, I believe it was, the able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] submitted an amendment to give the States of the Union an incentive to control outdoor advertising along the Interstate System. I felt that that matter involved some problems which needed to be resolved before such a proposal would justify bipartisan majority support in the Congress.

One such problem dealt with a constitutional question. I can illustrate it best, Mr. President, by indicating it in the following way: A State such as my own—California—has, by its own State constitutional provisions, delegated police power to incorporated communities within the borders of the State, to the extent that such incorporated communities, in determining the use to which private property may under their jurisdiction be put, act entirely apart from any legislation which the State legislature, on its own part, may pass for the rest of the area within the borders of the State.

As a Californian, I wanted my State to be able to avail itself of any incentive legislation adopted by Congress under which a State could reasonably exercise its zoning authority, and, thus, I wanted such legislation to recognize the problem of "home rule" State constitutions, and to permit States to enter into agreements with the Federal Government to control outdoor advertising on the Interstate System without penalizing them for their home-rule constitutional provisions.

In the intervening months between August and January, my staff and I studied, from a legal standpoint, that problem, and some other problems, as a result of which I was able, earlier this year, to introduce my own conception of an incentive bill by which States would be encouraged to adopt their zoning legislation, in reasonable manner, in accordance with the national policy.

I said earlier today I was perfectly delighted to work with the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon in the last several weeks, and to fashion what I am pleased to say in my judgment is an honest, realistic, and workable piece of legislation in this field. We jointly offered it to the Public Works Committee of the Senate, and, with one or two changes, by a majority vote the committee approved that amendment.

Earlier today the Senator from Oregon lucidly indicated what the proposal does. For the purpose of endeavoring to assist my fellow Senators who will avail themselves of the RECORD during the week, to help them determine how they will cast their vote on this problem, I wish to add just a few more words of my own as to the scope of this committee-approved amendment.

First of all, the billboard section of the highway bill before the Senate lays down a national policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the part of S. 3414 appearing on page 20, and continuing down to line 25 on page 21, entitled "National Policy," be set forth in the RECORD at this portion of my comments.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 122. Areas adjacent to the Interstate System.

"(a) National policy: To promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, it is hereby declared to be in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and to improve areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to that system. It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for:

(1) Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.

(2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

(3) Signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Senators may read that national policy and I hope, like the authors, agree with it in its goal, and, generally in the manner of reaching it.

With respect to that part of the national policy which appears after subparagraph (3), the committee saw fit specifically to provide that signs of not more than 500 square inches, advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located, would constitute an exception to the national policy.

Earlier the Senator from Oregon and I both discussed that amendment, which we believe to be unfortunate, because in our view, it would be the State legislatures, acting in accordance with their own constitutional authority, which would determine how and in what manner signs might appear along the Interstate System, in a fashion best designed to assist the traveling public, and in accordance with the national policy. At

any rate, aside from that amendment, as I say, it seems to me this basic policy should appeal to Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, the billboard regulation amendment, aside from recognizing exceptions which are noted in this national policy, recognizes that there are other exceptions which must exist, and which must exist reasonably.

By reason of the problem created by home-rule communities, the bill recognizes that under any agreements between the Federal Government and a State, incorporated communities which exercise home-rule authority shall be excluded.

Besides the constitutional reasons involved, Mr. President, I think there are some very practical reasons involved in recognizing that type of exception. I think, Mr. President, you would agree that in the average incorporated city in American through which an interstate high-speed road may run, for 2 or 10 or 15 miles, there is not considerable beauty to be preserved. I need not dwell upon that point, Mr. President, except to say the problem with respect to incorporated cities does not represent any overriding consideration in the legislation before the Senate; but, in the last analysis, it does recognize a constitutional question, and to that extent I think we have obviated a serious problem by our provision for excluding them.

It also recognizes, Mr. President, and this is most important to Senators who will be sitting in judgment on the problem, that the Interstate Highway System will inevitably pass through areas in the Nation which are commercial in character, which are industrial in character, or which are business in character. It recognizes that a State legislature, in adopting legislation under the incentives offered by the bill before the Senate, may recognize the character of such areas, and having recognized them, provide that the policy shall not apply in those areas.

It does something else. It provides that where any part of the Interstate Highway System is in being prior to the effective date of the present law—which is the year 1956—where no new rights-of-way are required to be purchased, the policy shall not apply. Thus we are not faced with the problem of retroactive application of zoning laws.

This is a forward-looking bill. This is a bill which, if enacted, will give the States of the American Union all across the country an opportunity to pass appropriate legislation to preserve the scenic beauty of the Nation through which the great bulk of the 41,000 miles of Interstate Highway System is yet to be constructed—indeed, yet to result in the acquisition of rights-of-way by all the 48 States.

Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from my State and elsewhere endorsing the provisions of the legislation which the able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I have jointly sponsored. I ask unanimous consent that a number of such communications be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
STATE GARDEN CLUBS, INC.,
*Alexandria, La., March 20, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: We understand that March 25 is an important day for advocates of billboard-control legislation.

May I remind you that 400,000 members of garden clubs throughout the Nation are vitally concerned over the protection of the new Interstate Highway System roadsides from billboard advertising, and we bespeak your support.

Very sincerely,
RUBY HARRIS
Mrs. Homer H. Harris,
*Chairman.*

---

THE GARDEN CLUB OF HONOLULU,
*March 31, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: We of the Garden Club of Honolulu are interested in the billboard legislation which is now pending. We believe that it would be a tragic mistake to permit our new highway to be cluttered up with billboards such as unfortunately already exist in many parts of the mainland of the United States.

America is a beautiful land and we are but trustees for future generations. Part of our obligation is to pass on our land to our children with all its strength and beauty. We believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of America want to see the new highway free from the unsightliness of advertising billboards. The legislation pending before your committee would go far to accomplish that end.

Although we in Hawaii have no voice in the Congress of the United States, we are Americans, many of us with our roots in the mainland of the United States and hence have an interest in the preservation of our land unimpaired with all its scenic beauty. I hope you will not feel it presumptuous for us to express our views. I am requested by the Garden Club of America to state our position.

The Members of Congress who have been in Hawaii, I am sure, were impressed by the absence of billboards along our highways. What we have done in Hawaii can be done in the new highway about to be constructed. We hope that you will act favorably on the pending legislation.

Respectfully,
DOROTHY ANTHONY
Mrs. J. Garner Anthony,
*President, Garden Club of America.*

---

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *March 21, 1958.*

Re billboards, interstate highways (absolutely no billboards).

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As the time approaches for a final decision on the above matter it behooves all of us to do what we can to resolve this issue, with its widespread ramifications for years to come, in the best way for the most.

Certainly this means irrevocably no billboards on the Interstate Highway System.

We, your constituents, look to you to aid in bringing order out of the present chaos of ambiguous legislation being instituted by special selfish interests in the name of politics.

Great strength to you in your task for us.

Very truly yours,
ELIZABETH T. MCMENEMLY.
(Mrs. Logan T.).

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *March 21, 1958.*

The Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: May I urge you to use your influence and vote against granting any permission to the advertising industry to erect billboards anywhere along the proposed new Federal highways. Both considerations of traffic safety and of elementary esthetics would seem to make such a stand highly desirable.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH A. BING.

---

SUNNYVALE STANDARD,
*Sunnyvale, Calif., March 20, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Enclosed is a copy of the editorial page which ran earlier this week in the Mountain View Register-Leader and the Sunnyvale Standard. I thought you would be interested in this support of a measure to control billboards along the new Federal system of superhighways.

I hope the Congress will institute these controls, and Governor Harriman's article in the recent Reporter well outlines the advantages for the American people in such legislation.

Very sincerely,
JOSEPH C. HOUGHTELING,
*Publisher.*

---

MONTEREY PENINSULA HERALD,
*Monterey, Calif., March 19, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: The Advertising Federation of America has sent me a long telegram signed by Robert M. Feemster, chairman of the board, asking my opposition to the antibillboard section of the Gore public roads bill. This is on the grounds "that an attack on the rights of one legal medium of advertising soon can be translated into attacks on all other mediums."

This is sheer nonsense. I am heartily in favor of the antibillboard section and only wish that it were more drastic. You and I have witnessed in California a deterioration of the appearance of our civilization due to failure to control the exploitation of our highways by billboard interests. In my county the billboard interests have fought one zoning effort after another, but they've always been licked for the past 25 years.

We hope that Congress will stand by and act to prevent wholesale piracy by these predators upon the new great highways built by the taxpayers of the country, from which the people have the right to enjoy the unmarred appearance of their fair land.

Best wishes.

Yours sincerely,
ALLEN GRIFFIN.

---

OAKLAND, CALIF., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Heartily favor keeping billboard amendment in highway bill.

Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT E. HALL.

---

BERKELEY, CALIF., *March 23, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Don't let America the beautiful become America the billboard. Heartily support Kuchel bill to control billboard advertising on national highways.

HELEN LYON HAWKINS,
QUAL HAWKINS.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *March 23, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
Strongly urge you vote "Yes" provision banning billboards Federal highway.
BRAYTON WILBUR.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *March 23, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
We are unalterably opposed to any advertising along Federal highways and hope you will make every effort to see that this is done and oppose any effort to drop billboard amendment to the highway bill or to further weaken it.
Mrs. DOROTHY E. WARDEN,
*President, Santa Barbara and Monticello Garden Club.*

MONTECITO, CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
Please vote to keep billboard amendment in highway bill.
Mrs. HAROLD (FRANCES) SHEETS.

BURLINGAME, CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
Strongly urge retention billboard amendment in highway bill and oppose further weakening of bill.
ONE HUNDRED MEMBERS OF HILLSBOROUGH GARDEN CLUB CALIFORNIA.

CARPENTERIA, CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
May I urge you to do everything you can to keep amendment in highway billboard bill and to oppose any effort to weaken it further.
Mrs. WALTER W. CLEM.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *March 23, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
Strongly urge you to support billboard clause in highway bill. Hope so much no amendments will be added to weaken it.
Mrs. FRANCIS E. LLOYD.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
To preserve the natural beauty of our State we ask you to vote for the billboard amendment in the highway bill soon to be voted upon. We feel you have the same affection for the State that we have.
MARY and WILLIAM C. MCDUFFIE.

MONTECITO CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
Do not permit the Highway Interstate billboard legislation to be further weakened.
LOGAN T. MCMENEMY.

MONTECITO, CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
Urge you to oppose any effort to further weaken billboard interstate legislation.
ELIZABETH T. MCMENEMY.

GOLETA, CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*
Please don't weaken highway bill and do keep billboard amendment.
Mrs. SELLAR BULLARD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield the floor?

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to speak?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to present a few items for the RECORD.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## RETENTION OF MILITARY LEGAL PERSONNEL

Mr. HUMPRHEY. Mr. President, in recent days and weeks we have been hearing a good deal about the critical problem facing the Armed Forces in connection with the retention of trained personnel. As one who subscribes to the objectives and most of the recommendations of the so-called Cordiner report, I am particularly hopeful that the Congress in the present session will embark on imaginative, new legislative steps to help assure that our Armed Forces may recruit and retain high-caliber personnel at all levels.

In our current emphasis upon retention of technical and scientific personnel, primary and essential though that may be, we must not lose sight of all of the other contributing factors which make for an effective military organization. Earlier Congresses have recognized a special need for professional manpower in the field of medicine and dentistry and have recognized it in a special way—authorizing what in effect is incentive pay for doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces. Such action by prior Congresses has successfully borne fruit in the availability and retention of medical and dental personnel.

Today the Armed Forces face a crisis in the field of retention of military lawyers.

In recent months this matter has been forcefully brought to my attention by letters from constituents who are interested in or serving in legal positions in the military. Following the introduction of S. 1165 by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], my office has received a good many letters endorsing the principles of the bill. I have selected five of these letters at random, and I ask unanimous consent that they, together with my answer to them, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

BLACKER & BLACKER,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
*Minneapolis, Minn., March 14, 1957.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I was gratified to learn at our periodic United States Air Force Reserve training meeting, made up of 20 Reserve officers, that Senator THURMOND has introduced S. 1165.

As I understand it, the purpose of said bill is to attempt in a measure to equalize pay and incentives for lawyers on duty with the Air Force similar to the provisions of law now in effect for the benefit of doctors and dentists who are on duty. Since there is a shortage of legal personnel in the Air Force and there seems to be difficulty in inducing the younger legal officers to stay on after they finish their initial tour, I think the bill will be of great benefit, and urge your support of the same.

All 20 members of our flight who were in attendance at the above meeting were in agreement that it would be in the best interests of service if Senator THURMOND'S bill was passed by Congress. In my own experience, while on active duty for short periods, I have had occasion to discuss the reasons why some of the young legal officers looked forward to the day that they had finished their tour of duty. The reason usually given for their desire to leave the service was based upon the fact that they were not being treated the same as the medical profession and that they felt they could do better in civilian life. These young officers on duty, as well as I, and other members of our Reserve training flight, see no reason why there should be a distinction made between the two professions. The amount of professional training initially is about the same, and the reduced opportunity for earning more in civilian life falls equally hard on both professions.

I am sure that all members of my Reserve training flight join with me in urging your support of S. 1165 as requested above.

Very sincerely yours,
HENRY S. BLACKER.

MARCH 20, 1957.
Mr. HENRY S. BLACKER,
*Attorney at Law,*
*Minneapolis, Minn.*

DEAR MR. BLACKER: Thank you very much for your letter of March 14 concerning S. 1165.

I know very well of the strong feeling of Air Force lawyers that they have been discriminated against in the past when their salaries are compared with those of other professional officers in the Air Force.

I am not on the committee which is considering this bill, but I am bringing your letter to their attention and assure you that I shall follow developments closely. You can expect me to support this legislation if it is recommended by the committee.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

EXHIBIT B

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 2, 1957.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: My son, Lt. Col. John F. Bell of Anchorage, Alaska, is interested in S. 1165, a bill to increase the pay of judge advocates in the Regular Army and place them on the same level as doctors in the Army Medical Service. I have been informed that this bill has the support of the American Bar Association.

John has charge of the Judge Advocate General's Office at Anchorage, Alaska, and is supposed to have eight lawyers to assist in the work. It is difficult for him to keep assistants because of the inadequate income. It would seem that the compensation of officers in the legal department should be placed on a par with the compensation paid to doctors in the Medical Service. I have not seen the bill, but I am advised that S. 1165 has been introduced for that purpose.

I will suggest to John that he write you directly and give you all the data pertaining to this bill. I trust that you will be able to give it such consideration and support as it seems to deserve.

I note that you are abroad just now. No doubt you will obtain much information in regard to the situation in the countries that you are able to visit.

With highest regards,

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT C. BELL,
*United States District Judge.*

MAY 9, 1957.

Hon. ROBERT C. BELL,
*United States District Judge,*
*St. Paul, Minn.*

DEAR JUDGE BELL: As you know, Senator HUMPHREY is in the Middle East on official Senate Foreign Relations Committee business. In his absence I wanted to acknowledge your letter of May 2.

Fortunately I can tell you that Senator HUMPHREY is deeply concerned about the discrimination favoring doctors over lawyers salary wise in the Air Force. You may count on a favorable vote from the Senator for S. 1165 in case it is favorably reported by the Armed Services Committee. Beyond that, I am sure that the Senator will discuss the situation with his colleagues on the committee. Meanwhile, I shall see to it that your own interest in this matter is brought to the committee's attention.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
By THOMAS L. HUGHES,
*Legislative Counsel.*

---

EXHIBIT C

SJA 5039th AIR BASE WING,
*Seattle, Wash., May 16, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: My father, United States District Judge Robert C. Bell of St. Paul, wrote to you on May 2 concerning S. 1165, a bill to afford military attorneys compensation to offset the higher income that they could obtain as civilians. I had in no way solicited his assistance. Mr. Hughes of your office acknowledged my father's letter with a very nice reply to the effect that you favored such a bill. Because of this correspondence, I take the liberty to briefly present my views.

Of some 25 young lawyers who have worked for me in the last several years, I have been able to retain only one past his earliest service-release date. All have professed satisfaction with the military except as to compensation. The result is that my office consists of 8 lawyers, most without experience, to do work which 5 experienced men could do better. These youngsters leave as they can start as civilians at nearly the compensation they receive here and, if at all competent, are soon making materially more.

My own case may be somewhat in point. As a lieutenant colonel with 17 years of active commissioned service, my before-tax annual pay and allowance total is $9,142.56. To support my family in Alaska, I have had to resort to teaching night school. I recently had an opportunity to take a position at $14,000 to be increased to $18,000 after 3 years. Needless to say, as soon as I can get a return through retirement on my time invested in the military, I will owe it to myself and my family to leave the Air Force. I would remain as long as possible with the incentive provided by S. 1165 as I highly prefer the military to private practice or employment.

It is my sincere belief that enactment of S. 1165 will save the Government money as it will greatly reduce the large lawyer turnover and enable us to do a better job with fewer people.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. BELL,
*Lieutenant Colonel,*
*United States Air Force.*

---

MAY 21, 1957.

Lt. Col. JOHN F. BELL,
*SJA 5039th Air Base Wing,*
*Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR COLONEL BELL: When I returned from the Middle East yesterday, I found your letter on my desk concerning S. 1165.

Your experience with lawyer turnover in the Air Force is typical of the reports which have come to my desk earlier. They all bolster the arguments in favor of S. 1165, and as my legislative counsel, Mr. Hughes, previously wrote to your father, you may be sure that I shall support this bill. During its consideration I shall have occasion to make use of the account you have sent me of your own experience. I know that it will be helpful.

Please do not hesitate to write to me any time I can be of assistance in any way.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

---

EXHIBIT D

BEMIDJI, MINN., *May 21, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At the present time I am home on leave from the United States Army where I am serving as first lieutenant in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. It has been brought to my attention that there is presently in Congress a bill which would give incentive pay as well as certain promotion advantages to members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps. Although I have not had an opportunity to read the bill and study it in detail, my present understanding of its contents results in my writing you to support it in the Senate.

Of course, my being a member of the Judge Advocate General's Corps certainly makes me an "interested party," but being somewhat close to the situation, I sincerely believe that such proposed measures are a necessity for the existence of a good Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Army. This I believe to be so for the following reason: What with the present 6-month programs in the Army, National Guard, and Air Force, good men with law degrees are going to accept 6-months' programs rather than take a direct commission for 3 years, even though it be at officer status. This I believe to be only a logical choice unless the military would offer career opportunities to lawyers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. I, myself, had a choice between 2 years in the draft and 3 years in the Judge Advocate General's Corps as an officer, and I chose the latter. However, today the choice is between 6 months and 3 years, and were I to have this choice today I would, without question, take the 6-months' program so that I could more quickly get back into the active practice of law in civilian life. I therefore feel that there is an essential need today to provide incentives to young lawyers to apply for 3-year judge advocate general commissions and from what I understand, the bill in question does just that.

Needless to say, my position rests upon the promise that a Judge Advocate General's Corps should be composed of the best grade of lawyers obtainable and I am sure this point need not be pressed here, since I am sure you are well aware of the need for competence and integrity in a group which defends the liberties of our servicemen.

I would certainly appreciate learning your position in regard to this bill—whether pro or con—as I can readily understand when other factors as, e. g., need for budget cuts, necessitate an adverse position. If you find reason for being in favor of the bill, I would appreciate your doing everything possible to effect its passage. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ALLEN I. SAEKS,
*First Lieutenant, Student Detachment,*
*the Judge Advocate General's School,*
*United States Army.*

---

JUNE 8, 1957.

1st Lt. ALLEN I. SAEKS,
*Student Detachment,*
*Judge Advocate General School,*
*Charlottesville, Va.*

DEAR LIEUTENANT SAEKS: Please forgive this delay in replying to your letter concerning a special bill for legal officers in the armed services.

S. 1165 introduced by Senator THURMOND, is the bill you have in mind. Unfortunately, there have been no reports on this bill yet from the appropriate administrative agencies. These reports are usually necessary before the Committee on Armed Services will begin official consideration of the bill.

There is a good deal of interest in this legislation, and I myself am sympathetic to it. You may be sure that I shall do everything possible to speed action on it once these reports have been received.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

---

EXHIBIT E

HEADQUARTERS, 83D FIGHTER-DAY WING (TAC),
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
*Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, N. C.*
*September 23, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In the last session of Congress, the Honorable STROM THURMOND introduced a bill whereby commissioned attorneys in the Armed Forces of the United States are to receive professional pay analogous to that now being received by those in the medical profession.

The American Bar Association in its recent meeting in London has, as a part of its six-point program concerning the coming year, emphasized more effective action to secure Federal legislation to end pay and rank discrimination against lawyers in the Armed Forces.

As a member of the Minnesota Bar, formerly practicing in the good city of Minneapolis, I am seeking your support in this matter and am hoping that all possible action will be taken to see that favorable legislation is enacted in the above regard.

Sincerely yours,

EDMOND T. SEXTON,
*First Lieutenant, United States Air Force, Judge Advocate.*

---

SEPTEMBER 27, 1957.

Mr. EDMOND T. SEXTON,
*Judge Advocate, Headquarters, 83d Fighter-Day Wing (TAC), Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, N. C.*

DEAR MR. SEXTON: Thank you for your recent letter. You have my assurance that I will strongly support S. 1165.

With the increasing need for trained attorneys, I feel that this bill would greatly contribute to the retention of such badly needed personnel in the armed services. S. 1165 was not acted upon this past session. The Armed Services Committee is awaiting reports from the Departments of Treasury and Defense before further action can be taken. I will continue to press for approval of S. 1165 in the next session.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

---

EXHIBIT F

ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE,
*Washington, March 19, 1958.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have this date received a copy of the statement of Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, before the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, appointed to study revised pay schedules for the military services.

Mr. Rhyne, after clearly setting forth the facts with respect to the problems of retention and experience level of judge advocates

in the military services, unqualifiedly recommended, inter alia, that the provisions of Senate bill 1165 be included as an amendment to Senate bill 3081 to be known as the Thurmond amendment.

That since shortly after World War II the uniformed services have been dismally unable to retain on a career basis young lawyers, who would not in the first instance be available to the military service were it not for their vulnerability to selective service, is an uncontrovertible fact. This retention problem will be further aggravated by the progressively greater number of senior judge advocates facing mandatory retirement beginning in 1960 and the number of such officers, who then and shortly thereafter, having completed 20 years active service, will seek voluntary retirement. That an equally dismal personnel picture which until recent years existed in the medical departments of the military services was substantially alleviated by the enactment of special incentive pay, promotion, and service-credit legislation is so manifest as to require no comment. Can any logical reason be advanced that similar legislation for service judge advocates if promptly enacted cannot accomplish similar results? The 1-year failure of the Department of Defense to submit any report on this legislation is clearly indicative that this problem exists and that it can only be solved by special incentive pay, promotion, and service-credit provisions for judge advocates.

As a long-time resident of the Fifth District, Hennepin County, a Minnesota attorney, and a career military judge advocate, I earnestly request your serious consideration of the aforementioned statement of Mr. Rhyne, the provisions of Senate bill 1165, and your active wholehearted support of such legislation.

Awaiting an expression of your opinion in the premises, I remain,

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. RITTER,
*Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force Deputy Staff Judge Advocate Headquarters, ARDC.*

---

MARCH 22, 1958.

Lt. Col. ROBERT J. RITTER,
*United States Air Force, Deputy Staff Judge Advocate, Headquarters, ARDC, Andrews Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR COLONEL RITTER: Thank you for your letter proposing that S. 1165 be adopted as an amendment to legislation providing a new formula for computing basic pay rates for members of the armed services.

I am in complete sympathy with the provisions of S. 1165 and I am fully cognizant of the problem of procuring and retaining judge advocates in the military services. You can count on my support.

It was a pleasure to hear from you and I want you to feel free to call upon me at any time.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this kind of interest on the part of lawyers everywhere, military and nonmilitary, has resulted in the endorsement of S. 1165 by several State bar associations. Among them was the Minnesota Bar Association which, on November 16, 1957, adopted a resolution to this effect.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as my acknowledgement of it, addressed to the executive secretary of the Minnesota State Bar Association.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT G

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING SENATE BILL 1165, 85TH CONGRESS

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States Senate bill 1165, which provides for additional pay and promotion for members of the legal profession serving with the armed services in a legal capacity, bringing the pay and promotion status of military lawyers to a level commensurate with the special professional pay and promotion schedule now available to members of the medical and other learned professions serving with the military; and

Whereas it is the sense of the board of governors of the Minnesota State Bar Association that lawyers should receive such commensurate compensation and rank, for their professional training and skill are certainly as valuable to the Armed Forces as those of the other learned professions; that the armed services are having great difficulty in procuring and retaining even a minimum of military lawyers, and that if they are unable to do so, it will be impossible to administer properly the present Uniform Code of Military Justice; that said code was made the basis of military justice largely through the efforts of civilian lawyers, and that we therefore have a responsibility to insure its successful operation; and that, finally, this bar has a peculiar interest in and knowledge of the needs and problems of the armed services: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the board of governors of the Minnesota State Bar Association endorses Senate bill 1165, and urges upon the Congress of the United States its passage, and the secretary be and he is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate from this State, and to the American Bar Association.

(Adopted at board of governors meeting November 16, 1957.)

---

DECEMBER 20, 1957.

Mr. BERT A. MCKASY,
*Executive Secretary, Minnesota State Bar Association, Minneapolis, Minn.*

DEAR MR. MCKASY: Thank you for sending me a copy of the resolution passed by the board of governors of the Minnesota State Bar Association approving Senate bill 1165.

I announced my support of this bill several months ago and you can count on me to work enthusiastically for its adoption. Unfortunately, I am not a member of the Senate committee which has jurisdiction over the bill, but you may assure the board of governors that I shall do everything possible to speed its enactment.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Last week, Mr. President, the American Bar Association issued a pamphlet containing the best summary of this whole problem yet to appear in public. It was prepared by the ABA's Committee on Lawyers in the Armed Forces and is entitled "Retention of the Military Lawyer."

The pamphlet deserves the widest possible circulation. I know the up-to-date facts and figures contained in it are of tremendous interest to many Members of the Senate. It is a pity that the excellent charts contained in this pamphlet cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because they state the predicament in graphic terms. The text of the pamphlet, however, and the conclusions are themselves of immense importance, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the American Bar Association pamphlet, except those charts which cannot be reproduced, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETENTION OF THE MILITARY LAWYER

(American Bar Association Committee on Lawyers in the Armed Forces)

THE LEGAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE SERVICES ARE FACING A CRITICAL SHORTAGE OF EXPERIENCED PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Due to the complete turnover of officers in the lieutenant grades, the coming eligibility for retirement of officer-lawyers in the higher grades and the serious shortage of captains (lieutenants) and majors (lieutenant commanders), the services are facing a critical shortage of legally qualified personnel for service in legal duties. This situation is being aggravated by the lack of ability to procure new lawyers.

The reason: pay is inadequate as compared with the civilian lawyers in Government service and with the income of lawyers in civilian practice.

MILITARY LAWYERS

(a) Participated in 184,348 trials by courts-martial during calendar year 1956, 5.84 times the 31,554 cases handled in all United States courts during fiscal year 1956.

(b) Reviewed for legal sufficiency during fiscal year 1957 procurements valued at more than $8 billion.

(c) Processed and handled contract appeals in the amount of $80 million during fiscal year 1957.

(d) Handled patent cases in total value of over $3,200,000,000 during fiscal year 1957.

(e) Handled Government litigation involving hundreds of millions of dollars.

(f) Attended 4,437 trials of United States Armed Forces personnel by foreign tribunals as legal observer designated to safeguard the rights guaranteed by treaty.

THE FIELD OF THE MILITARY LAWYER

*Military justice*

(a) Participates in each court-martial. Required by law as trial and defense counsel and law officer in each general court.

(b) Reviews all cases tried for legal sufficiency and other considerations.

(c) Represents accused and Government at trial and appellate levels.

(d) Serves as member of Boards of Review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General.

(e) Advises the commander on all military justice matters.

*Military affairs*

(a) Serves as general counsel to commander on all military legal matters involving interpretation of laws pertaining to the military.

(b) Advises as to administrative matters involving legal points.

(c) Expert in pay, promotion, retirement, and personnel laws.

(d) Renders legal advice on board actions concerning elimination, financial responsibility, etc.

*Procurement*

(a) Reviews and renders legal advice on procurement matters.

(b) Handles contract dispute appeals before Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals.

*Patents*

(a) Controls and coordinates legal aspects of patent matters within the services.

*Tax and litigation*

(a) Handles matters concerning foreign, Federal, State, and local tax matters affecting the military services.

(b) Acts as house counsel by collecting evidence, interviewing witnesses, writing briefs, and doing everything short of trial appearance.

*International law*

(a) Observes all trials of military personnel by foreign courts to see that accuseds' rights under treaty are protected.

(b) Participates in negotiation and preparation of treaties and agreements with foreign countries.

(c) Renders advice on air law.

(d) Renders advice on foreign law.

*Claims*

(a) Handles all claims for or against the Government generated in military operations.

*Legal assistance*

(a) Furnishes legal assistance to military personnel and dependents. Gives advice pertaining to and prepares documents concerned with landlord-tenant relations; insurance; wills; retirement; medical benefits; tort actions; voting privileges; claims; domicile; taxes; deeds; complaints; marriage; divorce; adoptions; conditional sales contracts; repossession, and other facets of the law and human relations.

*Legislation*

(a) Analyzes and explains proposed legislation affecting the services.

(b) Drafts legislation emanating from the services.

HOW MANY CAREER MILITARY LAWYERS DO WE NEED?

Total requirement for military lawyers, career and Reserve, should be in the ratio of 1.5 lawyers per 1,000 actual troop strength. Present ratio authorized is 1.15 per 1,000. Present "on board" ratio is 1.12 per 1,000.

How many career military lawyers is the minimum required for adequate stability and experience? Two-thirds of the number of lawyers authorized for the services.

*Actual strength by grade against authorized strength*

U. S. ARMY

| | Authorized | Assigned |
|---|---|---|
| Colonel | 65 | 129 |
| Lieutenant colonel | 157 | 158 |
| Major | 196 | 134 |
| Captain | 333 | 193 |
| Lieutenant | 278 | 448 |

U. S. AIR FORCE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Colonel | 93 | 61 |
| Lieutenant colonel | 166 | 137 |
| Major | 388 | 216 |
| Captain | 474 | 281 |
| Lieutenant | 139 | 501 |

JAG-LAW SPECIALISTS U. S. NAVY

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Captain | 45 | 63 |
| Commander | 114 | 108 |
| Lieutenant commander | 114 | 57 |
| Lieutenant | 105 | 55 |
| Lieutenant (junior grade) | 41 | 65 |
| Ensign | 0 | 25 |

TYPICAL COMMENTS RECEIVED

Senior Air Force commander: "I note on page 8 of the Air Force Times for March 2, 1957, a statement that bills have been introduced into both the House and the Senate which would pay judge advocate officers a 'special bonus of from $100 to $250 per month.' Until recently I was opposed to special pay for judge advocate officers for the reason that the problem of retention exists across the board. However, our problems and experience here at * * * have convinced me that definite action must be taken to retain in the Air Force our younger judge advocate officers in more substantial numbers than has been possible in the past.

"Besides the staff judge advocate and two field-grade judge advocate officers, I am authorized four judge advocates in the grade of captain and two in the grade of lieutenant. I have not had a single judge advocate officer in the grade of captain assigned to his headquarters since September 1955. Of necessity, relatively inexperienced judge advocate officers in the grade of second and first lieutenant have been required to perform duties demanding the experience level of captain.

"With a total authorization of 9 judge advocate officers, this headquarters has lost 6 judge advocate officers since July 1956, 4 of them to inactive duty. As replacements, we have received 1 lieutenant with approximately 1 year's experience and 3 recent graduates from law school without experience. One of the 3 recent law-school graduates has received notification that he has passed the New York Bar examination but he has not as yet become a member of the bar. One judge advocate authorization has not been filled and is now vacant.

"I am aware of the complexities of present-day military law in both the military justice and military affairs areas. No matter how conscientious and promising a young judge advocate officer may be, there is no substitute for experience. I can see no solution to the problem other than to retain in the Air Force younger judge advocates in greater numbers.

"Discussions with young judge advocate officers reverting to inactive duty from this headquarters have indicated that the hope of greater remunerative rewards in civilian practice stands high in their list of reasons for not remaining on active duty. While I fully appreciate that there are other reasons why judge advocate officers do not remain on active duty past their obligated tours, I am convinced that extra pay would serve to retain an appreciable number of lawyers in the service. I strongly recommend Air Force support of the proposed Congressional measures which would provide special pay for judge advocate officers."

Senior judge advocate: "My answer to No. 1 above is negative simply because I have plenty of service and am now past the 20-year mark. Fortunately for me I have other income.

"In view of ever-increasing and exacting demands placed on the young lawyer today in the service, the thought that no one has heretofore championed the cause of incentive pay for them makes me indignant. And the lack of such incentive has simply meant—these past 5 years—thousands of these lads coming into the service, getting valuable training at Government expense, and going back home and making use of such training in their private practice. I'm sure the record will eloquently testify to this.

"Lack of action to date proves to have been truly penny wise and pound foolish. And, last but not least, the caliber of our judge advocate officer and the quality of service are simply not improving today. The better men just aren't interested as matters stand right now."

Junior judge advocate: "The lawyer in civilian life is generally regarded as being an above-average individual. The military pay for lawyers establishes that in the eyes of the military force the lawyer is valued as a second- or third-rate officer and is to be paid accordingly; such a situation does not inspire one to continue service with such an organization."

Senior staff judge advocate: "Only this week I have been confronted with a situation which illustrates the problem. One of the brightest young attorneys that we have in the office is shortly due to complete his required active duty tour and has decided to apply for his release from the service, I have discussed the advantages of a career with him. However, he informs me that he has been offered $5,200 a year to start with one of the larger law firms in a midwestern city. They have assured him that within 5 years he will be earning upward from $10,000 a year, and can depend upon this to increase in later years. No amount of persuasion can convince him that a career in the Air Force offers similar opportunities."

Junior judge advocate: "It is my opinion that what is happening to the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Air Force is the result of this gross inequality of treatment. We have good, capable personnel at the top of the ladder and to some depth at present, but slowly the gap as to capable personnel is widening. By that, I mean that, in my opinion, at the present trend, in 10 years we will have lawyers of the rank of major and higher with experience and capability at one end and a constant turnover of second lieutenant ROTC new lawyers with no experience.

"I have yet to come in contact with one competent new lawyer, second lieutenant, with no previous military time, who is planning to remain in the service. We need good young lawyers who desire to make the service a career. Could you, in good conscience, ask a competent young lawyer to make the service his career under the present setup? For all of his education and talent, he is in no better position than a 4-year ROTC graduate. In my opinion, these young men are making a wise decision to enter private practice."

Junior judge advocate: "These are my circumstances: Two years ago I voluntarily returned to active duty after 10 years as a civilian—4 in college and 6 in the practice of law in California. When I returned my intentions were to remain indefinitely and naturally the prospect of a retirement sometime in the future was a matter to which I gave some thought. I like the Air Force and very much want to continue to serve in it. I like military life, and I enjoy the judge advocate work. In spite of all this I find that I am definitely considering a request to return to inactive status in the summer of 1958. The choice of time is solely for the convenience of my older daughter who is in school. The reason is that I cannot live in the manner to which I have become accustomed on the income I am receiving. Two years of active duty has made an inroad of several thousand dollars into my savings. I consider myself very lucky that my private practice provided me with these savings, but, unfortunately, they are not inexhaustible. I cannot continue to permit my monthly living expenses to run ahead of my income at the present rate. Past experience assures me that there is no need to as the civilian practice of law will meet my modest financial demands. Please do not assume that my problem is the result of personal extravagance. My family's standard of living is quite modest. Our tastes would certainly not be considered in the champagne class. We maintain a home costing less than $11,000, 1 new car and 1 "klunker," that wouldn't sell for $200. Our children, both daughters, number only two, and I do not consider this unreasonable for a 37-year-old lawyer. I believe our most expensive diversion results from our weakness for broiled African lobster tails. However, I feel I have earned this small delight by the many years of training and experience that I have put into my profession. I do not drink and neither does my wife. Neither of us gambles. I mention this not as a parading of virtue but only to imply that we do not indulge in either of these expensive pastimes, which can wreak such devastating havoc on a budget. True we occasionally spent a few dollars on a Saturday night for a three-game series of bowling and we do enjoy traveling a little. Is a lawyer expecting too much when he asks that his income provide him with such moderate luxury? I am sure it would be considered a very plain life by many and austere to some."

*Military pay and allowances by age of officer and specialty*

| Age | 30 | 32 | 34 | 36 | 40 | 42 | 46 | 50 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Over 4 (O-3) | Over 6 (O-3) | Over 8 (O-3) | Over 10 (O-3) | Over 14 (O-4) | Over 16 (O-4) | Over 18 (O-5) | Over 2 (O-6) |
| Lawyer: | | | | | | | | |
| Basic pay | $374.40 | $405.60 | $421.20 | $436.80 | $514.80 | $530.40 | $608.40 | $748.80 |
| Allowances | 150.48 | 150.48 | 150.48 | 150.48 | 167.58 | 167.58 | 184.68 | 184.68 |
| Total | 524.88 | 556.08 | 571.68 | 587.28 | 682.38 | 697.98 | 793.08 | 933.48 |
| | Over 6 (O-3) | Over 8 (O- ) | Over 10 (O-3) | Over 12 (O-4) | Over 16 (O-4) | Over 18 (O-5) | Over 22 (O-6) | Over 26 (O-6) |
| ROTC line officer: | | | | | | | | |
| Nonrated basic pay | $405.60 | $421.20 | $436.80 | $499.20 | $530.40 | $608.40 | $748.80 | $780.00 |
| Allowances | 150.48 | 150.48 | 150.48 | 167.58 | 167.58 | 184.68 | 184.68 | 184.68 |
| Total | 556.08 | 571.68 | 587.28 | 666.78 | 697.98 | 793.08 | 933.48 | 964.68 |
| | Over 6 (O-3) | Over 8 (O-3) | Over 10 (O-3) | Over 12 (O-4) | Over 16 (O-4) | Over 18 (O-5) | Over 22 (O-6) | Over 26 (O-6) |
| Line officer, aviation or submarine duty: | | | | | | | | |
| Basic pay | $405.60 | $421.20 | $436.80 | $499.20 | $530.40 | $608.40 | $748.80 | $780.00 |
| Allowances | 150.48 | 150.48 | 150.48 | 167.58 | 167.58 | 184.68 | 184.68 | 184.68 |
| Hazardous-duty pay | 180.00 | 185.00 | 190.00 | 215.00 | 230.00 | 245.00 | 245.00 | 245.00 |
| Total | 736.08 | 756.68 | 777.28 | 881.78 | 927.98 | 1,038.08 | 1,178.48 | 1,209.68 |
| | Over 8 (O-3) | Over 10 (O-3) | Over 14 (O-4) | Over 16 (O-4) | Over 18 (O-5) | Over 22 (O-6) | | Over 26 (O-6) |
| Doctor, dentist: | | | | | | | | |
| Basic pay | $421.20 | $436.80 | $499.20 | $530.40 | $608.40 | $748.80 | ---------- | $780.00 |
| Allowances | 150.48 | 150.48 | 167.58 | 167.58 | 184.68 | 184.68 | ---------- | 184.68 |
| Special pay | 150.00 | 150.00 | 200.00 | 250.00 | 250.00 | 250.00 | ---------- | 250.00 |
| Total | 721.68 | 737.28 | 866.78 | 947.98 | 1,043.08 | 1,183.48 | ---------- | 1,214.68 |
| | Over 6 (O-3) | Over 8 (O-3) | Over 10 (O-3) | Over 12 (O-4) | Over 16 (O-4) | Over 18 (O-5) | Over 22 (O-6) | Over 26 (O-6) |
| Veterinarian: | | | | | | | | |
| Basic pay | $405.60 | $421.20 | $436.80 | $499.20 | $530.40 | $608.40 | $748.80 | $780.00 |
| Allowances | 150.48 | 150.48 | 150.48 | 167.58 | 167.58 | 184.68 | 184.68 | 184.68 |
| Special pay | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Total | 656.08 | 671.68 | 687.28 | 766.78 | 797.98 | 893.08 | 1,033.48 | 1,064.68 |
| Civilian lawyer (average net income) | 615.93 | 690.00 | 740.00 | 814.00 | 1,032.00 | 1,032.00 | 1,108.00 | 1,172.00 |

NOTES

1. Lawyer enters service at age 25 with 3 years' constructive credit for promotion purposes only. ROTC line officer enters at age 22 so by age 30 he has almost 8 years for pay and promotion purposes. Therefore, at 30 years of age the lawyer has over 4 years for pay purposes, the ROTC line officer nearly 8 years.
2. Legal education costs a minimum of $2,000 per year (exclusive of board and room cost). A college graduate entering the service at the time the prospective lawyer enters law school earns approximately $14,000—total pay and allowances—while the law student earns nothing and must finance his own education. Then the lawyer enters the service with a minimum $20,000 deficit in educational costs and earnings loss.
3. The doctor enters the service at age 27. He receives 5 years' constructive credit for both promotion and pay purposes so that by age 30 he is paid for over 8 years.

*Present pay versus proposed pay—Military*

| | Present pay range | Proposed pay range (present administration proposals, Corbiner modified) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lieutenant (junior grade) or 1st lieutenant. | $401.44-$477.48 | $477.48-$517.08 | 4 years | 18 years before any substantial increase. 18 years of service produces maximum of $400 additional income under present and proposed pay scales. This represents an average increase of $22.22 per month per year of service. |
| Lieutenant or captain | 524.88- 602.88 | 570.48- 650.48 | 7 years | |
| Lieutenant commander or major. | 666.78- 697.98 | 697.98- 797.98 | do | |
| Commander or lieutenant colonel. | 793.08- 824.28 | 894.68- 1,024.68 | 4 years | |
| Captain or colonel | 933.48- 964.68 | 1,134.68- 1,249.68 | ---------- | |

NOTE.—A young attorney can ancitipate the same financial advancement in 5 years of civilian practice that he can anticipate in 18 years of military service. In addition, there is no ceiling on his civilian income. This comparison indicates that proposed pay scales will not help in retention of the military lawyer.

PRESENT SITUATION

Rank and promotion eligibility: Military lawyers are 1 to 3 years behind their line contemporaries of same age.

Longevity pay: Military lawyers are at least 3 to 4 years behind their line contemporaries.

Legal officer: Potential lawyers must spend at least 3 to 4 years after college acquiring legal education to qualify for a commission as a military lawyer.

Line officer: Potential line officer can thus be commissioned 3 to 4 years sooner than a lawyer. Eligible for promotion to first lieutenant (lieutenant junior grade) after 18 months' active duty.

WHY LAWYERS DO NOT DESIRE MILITARY CAREERS

Because of the postcollege years he must spend in law school and preparation for his bar examination, the military lawyer commences his career 3 to 4 years later than does his college contemporary in the line and most of the other staff corps. Under present law this causes him to remain permanently behind his contemporaries in both promotion eligibility and longevity pay. It makes him 3-4 years older upon reaching the retirement eligibility age. In the event he is retired for physical disability, his retired pay at a given age is less—due to the longevity factor. All during his career, the military lawyer loses up to 4 years longevity pay credit and receives approximately $50 per month less than his line officer contemporary. It should also be noted that military lawyers are required to finance their own professional education. It is a false economy "penny wise and dollar foolish" to attempt the legal mission with inexperienced military lawyers, when one considers that experienced military lawyers save the United States Government millions of dollars above their costs.

Many detailed studies of this problem have been made. The results of these studies indicate many reasons why lawyers prefer to practice their professions in civilian communities rather than in the military. The most frequent reasons given for lack of interest in a military career are: (1) inadequate pay; (2) lack of promotion; and (3) lack of prestige. There are unquestionably other factors, but these are the most important.

COMPARE THE MILITARY LAWYER WITH THE CIVIL-SERVICE LAWYER

With respect to the possibility of utilizing greater numbers of civil-service lawyers, there are limits on the number that can be utilized and, more important, on the number that can be procured. In general, civilian lawyers in significant numbers can only be obtained in or near large population centers where they have professional and cultural advantages. When civil-service lawyers are employed, they receive higher pay and have shorter working hours than their military colleagues; they are also entitled to overtime pay and are not subject to military regulations and responsibilities, change of assignment, or overseas duty. The utilization of civil-service lawyers is not the solution to the problem of retaining more young officer lawyers on active duty.

TYPICAL EXAMPLES OF REASONS FOR MILITARY LAWYERS LEAVING THE SERVICE

Captain: Graduated from law school in 1948; employed by the Government from 1948 to 1951, in a civilian capacity, at which time he was recalled to active duty as captain, JAGD USAF; principal assignment during period of active duty was staff judge advocate of an Air Force depot with annual pay and allowances of $7,095.36; reverted to inactive status in March 1953 to take employment as civilian GS-12 attorney adviser with the Air Force at starting annual salary of $7,570; in 1955 left the Government service to take employment as special legal counsel with a New York corporation at a starting annual salary of $12,500 per year; within less than a year later this salary was increased to $13,500.

First lieutenant: Graduated from law school in 1951; entered on initial tour of active duty as first lieutenant, JAGD USAF, in April 1953; continuously assigned as assistant for patent matters, Patents and Royalties Division, with annual pay and allowances per year of $5,729.76; reverts to inactive status on June 14, 1956, to take employment in the legal department of a Detroit corporation at starting annual salary of $10,000 per year.

First lieutenant: Enlisted in the Air Force in December 1952 and was commissioned second lieutenant in March 1953; in November 1953, as second lieutenant, assigned to JAGD USAF with duty as assistant for patent matters, Patents and Royalties Division; promoted to first lieutenant in June 1954 with annual pay and allowances of $5,729.76; separated from the Air Force in September 1956 to take employment in the legal department of a Massachusetts insurance corporation at a starting annual salary of $5,800 in addition to which he is guaranteed a 10 percent automatic annual increase in salary each year until his annual salary approximates $12,000, at which time he will be considered for an executive position at a higher annual salary. In addition to the monetary consideration, he has been guaranteed hospitalization and participation in a retirement program. He has also been assured that he will not be transferred and is also permitted to buy any type of insurance he desires at wholesale rates.

Captain: Graduated from law school in 1952; entered on initial tour of active duty as first lieutenant, JAGD USAF, in December 1952; held almost continuous assignment as assistant for contract matters in the Procurement Law Division; promoted to captain in March 1956 with annual pay and allowances of $6,088.56; in May 1956 reverted to inactive status to take employment as general counsel for New Jersey corporation at a starting annual salary of $12,000; the same officer was also offered a civilian GS–12 attorney-adviser position with the Air Force at a starting annual salary of $7,570.

First lieutenant: Entered on initial tour of active duty as second lieutenant, JAGD USAF, in September 1952; thereafter continuously assigned as assistant for military affairs and military justice in the Military Affairs, Military Justice, and Claims Division; after promotion to first lieutenant in January 1954 drew annual pay and allowances of $5,729.76; in September 1954 reverted to inactive status to take employment in a mortgage department of a New York bank at a starting annual salary of $6,000 per year; in addition to this salary he was guaranteed the following: a 10 percent increase in annual salary at the completion of first year with annual increases thereafter; free hospitalization; free life insurance in the sum of $6,000 for the first year and free life insurance in the sum of $10,000 thereafter.

Lieutenant: Graduated from law school in 1955. Left the military service in 1957 to work for New York City law firm. Starting salary $6,500 per year plus year-end bonus. Promised $1,000 a year raise in pay each year for the next 5 years.

Captain: Graduated from law school in 1950. Left the military service in 1953 to join Chicago law firm at $6,000 per year. Present salary is $10,000 per year.

Law school professor: "I am aware, of course, that you will have been using other means of recruitment and that the position involved may already be filled. Until I hear otherwise, however, I shall continue to be on the lookout for a likely prospect for your position. I may say parenthetically that the demand for law graduates continues at a high level. Three of our graduating seniors were offered $6,500 per annum as starting salaries in private practice. You can appreciate that a position paying $6,400 to a man of 3 years' experience will not attract a man who is having a reasonable degree of success and satisfaction in his practice. Valuable as experience is, my guess is that you would be likely to get a better man, inch for inch and dollar for dollar, if you start out a man fresh from law school who can be trained and who comes to work with the sharpness of youth and who does not have his zeal worn off. You have, of course, not sought my advice on your personnel policies, but I make this general observation because in my own experience with the placement process, I found it safer to recommend candidates for positions who have just completed their training than it is to recommend candidates who have had 2 or 3 years' experience and who are willing to take a change."

SAVINGS TO THE GOVERNMENT

For every career lawyer that we have on active duty, we will eliminate the need for 3 newly commissioned lawyers each 7 years. The cost to the Government for each noncareer officer-lawyer who separates upon completion of his tour is only slightly less than $6,000, considering commissioning expenses, salary, travel pay, schooling, and on-the-job training, uniform allowances, etc. Each inexperienced officer will cost the Government a minimum of 25 to 30 percent of its investment, not to mention the cost incurred through inexperienced legal advice.

With the services attempting to procure a minimum of 350 new officers per year, and the number becoming progressively greater year by year as senior experienced officers leave the service, the minimum total cost of this replacement program can be placed at $2,100,000 per year. This cost will increase by year.

Cost of proposed legislation can be estimated at approximately $6,500,000 per year. Therefore, the cost of such legislation will be partially offset by the lessened rate of turnover.

*Computation of cost*

| | |
|---|---|
| Salary | $14,629.68 |
| Travel | 500.00 |
| Processing | 1,000.00 |
| School | 1,500.00 |
| On-the-job training | 1,500.00 |
| Uniform allowance | 250.00 |
| Total | 19,379.68 |

Thirty percent of the above total equals $5,813.90.

EFFECT OF VARIOUS PAY SCALES ON RETENTION OF MILITARY LAWYERS

To ascertain the effect of present and proposed pay scales on the willingness of military lawyers to remain in service, a questionnaire was sent to every military lawyer on active duty in all the armed services, and to recently separated personnel. More than half of these persons responded by February 28, 1958. The meaningful answers are tabulated below:

*Regular officers and career reservists*

1. Is it your present intention to seek voluntary retirement upon completing 20 years of active duty? Yes, 94.4 percent; no, 5.5 percent.

2. If your answer to the preceding question is in the affirmative, are your present rate of pay and the existing pay scales the primary factors in your decision to leave the service? Yes, 89.9 percent; no, 10.1 percent.

3. If your answer to question No. 1 is in the affirmative, would enactment of the Cordiner pay proposals alone afford sufficient financial incentive to cause you to alter your decision? Yes, 8.1 percent; no, 91.9 percent.

4. If you plan to seek voluntary retirement after 20 years, would the enactment of the military lawyer, financial incentive legislation (S. 1165) now pending in the Senate, cause you to change your plans in this regard? Yes, 92.1 percent; no, 7.9 percent.

*Military lawyers serving an obligated tour*

5. Do you plan to leave the military service upon completion of your obligated period of service? Yes, 99.1 percent; no, 0.9 percent.

6. If your answer to the preceding question is in the affirmative, are your present rate of pay and in the existing pay scales the primary factors in your decision to leave the service? Yes, 76.9 percent; no, 23.1 percent.

7. If you answered the previous question affirmatively, would the enactment of the Cordiner pay proposals alone afford sufficient financial incentive to cause you to alter your decision? Yes, 6.8 percent; no, 93.2 percent.

8. If you presently plan to leave the active military service upon completion of your obligated tour, would enactment of the military lawyer, financial incentive legislation (S. 1165) now pending in the Senate, cause you to change your plans in this regard? Yes, 79.4 percent; no, 20.6 percent.

*Military lawyers who have recently left active duty for civilian practice*

9. Was inadequate pay the major deterrent to your remaining in the military legal field? Yes, 38.1 percent; no, 61.9 percent.

10. Would you have seriously considered remaining in the service had appropriate military lawyer, financial incentive legislation, been in existence? Yes, 50.6 percent; no, 49.4 percent.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The legal departments of the military services are facing a serious personnel shortage. Charts 1 through 5, examined with certain facts in mind, give rise to considerable concern as to the ability of the judge advocates general to perform in the future not only regularly assigned functions, but those functions required of them by law. The facts to be considered are (1) a complete turnover of those officers in the junior grades who are serving an obligated tour of duty; (2) the present shortage of officers in the major and captain grades and equivalent; and (3) the coming eligibility for retirement of the great percentage of senior judge advocates and law specialists. According to a recently conducted poll, 80 percent of senior officers presently plan on retiring at the point of initial eligibility. The critical nature of the situation is pointedly affirmed by the recent experience of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Air Force in the Air Force augmentation program, when 238 applications for regular status were received for 387 spaces, as contrasted to 60,000 applications from Air Force line officers for approximately 20,000 spaces.

Procurement programs have generally produced adequate results in the past. Such success is attributable almost entirely to the existence of selective service which forced the young draft vulnerable lawyer to apply for a direct commission as the alternative to enlisted service. Now, with the Army 6 months' training program and Executive Order No. 10714, June 18, 1957, procurement programs for direct Reserve commissions at this time are lagging far behind past programs, giving rise to justifiable apprehension. For instance, the Air Force offered 240 direct commissions in the Judge Advocate General's Department during fiscal year 1958. Indications are that 160 of these spaces will remain unfilled.

It is often stated that retention problems exist in other fields in the military services, but procurement of such specialists does not appear to be troublesome.

Such retention problems exist in fields where the specialist is trained as a military man on active duty. On the other hand, the lawyer is not trained at Government expense but at his own; consequently, the staffing of the military legal departments involves problems of both retention and procurement. The following tabulation indicates that lawyer retention is much more serious in nature than overall retention problems.

[Percent]

| | Military career plans [1] | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | Undecided | No |
| All officers, USAF: | | | |
| Line officer | 68.8 | 15.5 | 15.7 |
| Judge advocate | 49.6 | 20.0 | 30.4 |
| Noncareer reservist, USAF: | | | |
| Line officer | 12.4 | 31.4 | 52.3 |
| Judge advocate | 2.0 | 26.6 | 71.4 |

[1] Figures taken from the USAF Personnel Report, Characteristics and Attitudes From Sample Surveys, Oct. 1, 1957. This report reflects attitudes as of May 1957.

Therefore, unless corrective action is taken, the legal departments will not be sufficiently manned with experienced lawyers to perform the mandatory functions prescribed by the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

2. The desire of the senior military lawyer to retire upon reaching eligibility, and the reluctahce of the young lawyer to choose a military career, is based upon several factors:

(a) Pay: Charts 6, 7, and 8 reveal certain inequities in pay within the military services. More specifically, they indicate that the military lawyer receives less pay throughout his military career than either his line or professional contemporaries, including doctors, dentists, and veterinarians. His average income is far less than the civilian member of the profession in addition to the fact that his earnings are limited throughout his military career. Also, his income as an attorney employed by the Federal Government would be considerably greater. Opportunities outside of the military are far more attractive.

(b) Promotion and prestige: Temporary promotion practices in the military services generally fall within the same pattern; from first lieutenant to captain, 4 years; from captain to major, 7 years; from major to lieutenant colonel, 5 years; lieutenant colonel to colonel, 5 years; therefore, advancement is extremely slow, and lacks any degree of certainty. Present indications point to the fact that these periods of time will increase until they are equal to the period of time in grade established by the Officer Personnel Act, to wit: First lieutenant to captain, 4 years; captain to major, 7 years; major to lieutenant colonel, 7 years; lieutenant colonel to colonel, 4 years. Insofar as prestige is concerned, line officers are generally unaware of the field of the military lawyer. His advanced professional education and standing is seldom recognized. Therefore, under existing conditions, the military lawyer must possess a dedication to his service, and a love of his work that will counterbalance his desire for professional success in civilian life and the resultant rewards, in order to choose a military career as a lawyer. This is seldom encountered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my hope, Mr. President, that appropriate action may soon be taken in the House and Senate Armed Services Committees which will assure that this problem be met. We cannot continue to operate the Armed Forces, combining both the interests of efficiency and justice, without the continued performance of highly qualified, technically trained, military lawyers. The facts of the situation now demonstrate beyond question that unless corrective action is taken, the Armed Forces will not be sufficiently manned with experienced lawyers to perform the mandatory functions prescribed by the Uniform Code of Military Justice. We need speedy action along the lines of S. 1165, or comparable legislation adopted in connection with a more general bill. I hope that such action will be forthcoming.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

## ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order to keep the RECORD up to date relating to the developments in the economy, I have been attempting from day to day to have printed in the RECORD the latest economic reports.

The latest economic reports indicate that the recession continues to grow. A spot check by the Associated Press, as reported this past weekend, shows that unemployment is increasing in the Nation's major labor markets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press report of March 23 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOT CHECK INDICATES RISE IN UNEMPLOYMENT

A spot check by the Associated Press showed yesterday that unemployment still is increasing in March in the Nation's major labor markets.

The sample, while not nationwide in scope, covered more than a dozen of the biggest employment areas. It showed the idle in these areas increased by about 150,000 from the middle of February to the middle of March.

But, like the first robin in the spring, there are some hopeful signs. The survey data, together with the Government's latest unemployment compensation claims figures, suggest the jobless peak is close at hand and there may be some decline in unemployment in April.

JOB PICTURE NOW

The job picture at the moment appears to be this: Unemployment is still rising, but its upward momentum is rapidly slowing down. This is due to the usual spring employment pickup on farms and in other outdoor work as weather improves. This improvement has been delayed this year because of late winter storms.

But an April decline in the number of jobless, unless it is quite substantial, would not spell an end to the recession. Unemployment normally drops by about 400,000 or 500,000 between February and April. And available data indicates no decline in March.

An April pickup in construction, farming, and other outdoor work could reduce somewhat the overall national unemployment total, last counted by the Government at 5,173,000 as of mid-February.

But the seasonal gain in outdoor work would not signal an economic revival unless there is also job improvement in the auto and plane factories, steel mills, and other types of manufacturing and mining, the hard core of the current economic trouble.

PENNSYLVANIA OUTLOOK

In Pennsylvania, where the last jobless tally was 464,000, William L. Batt, Jr., State secretary of labor and industry, expressed doubt that a seasonal upswing in construction really would bite deeply into the State's jobless problem.

"The important thing is what happens in factory employment," Mr. Batt said. "What we need most is for men to get back to work in heavy manufacturing. The steel industry is important. As long as it's operating at only about 50 percent of capacity we're going to have a problem."

The Federal Reserve Board said a few days ago that production, employment, income, and retail sales all had declined in February. It noted further early March declines in auto production as well as in mineral output, including crude oil.

The Government's job data for March will not be known until the second week of April. A month ago President Eisenhower said there was every indication March would commence to see the start of a pickup in job opportunities, marking "the beginning of the end of the downturn." Later, Gabriel Hauge, his economic assistant, said he expected to see the downturn "slow to a stop" between April and July.

The latest Labor Department report shows that in the week of March 8 there were 3,274,800 jobless among workers insured by the unemployment compensation system. Only about two-thirds of all the Nation's workers are covered under the system.

The 3,274,800 figure represents a slight decline from the prior week's total, but an increase of about 138,000 over the week of February 15, when the Government took its last overall tally of the unemployed.

Some of the unemployment changes among insured workers in key States, with figures for March 8 listed first, followed in parentheses by the February 15 week totals:

California, 311,303 (315,843); Oregon, 44,244 (45,424); Washington, 62,134 (71,417); New York, 384,721 (361,439); Pennsylvania, 332,098 (309,604); Ohio, 208,650 (202,184); Illinois, 172,672 (163,644); Indiana, 88,271 (87,571); Missouri, 62,358 (65,882); Rhode Island, 27,445 (26,317); Alabama, 46,575 (46,310); and Texas, 72,926 (65,460).

The AP spot check showed seasonal job improvement in California, Washington, and Oregon, the West Coast States which have been hard hit. Plywood plants in Oregon and Washington which had closed because of low prices have now reopened, and timber activities are picking up. Boeing Aircraft at Seattle has delayed scheduled layoffs.

Boston reports the job situation in the six-State New England area is static, with a slight increase in insurance-covered unemployment between mid-February and mid-March. The increase was heaviest in Connecticut, where the legislature is in special session considering antirecession proposals.

In New York figures for unemployment claims shot up substantially in both the State and New York City between mid-February and early March. Martin W. Wilmington, New York City economist, said the March picture "shows some change for the worse." In Michigan, center of the hard-pressed auto industry, mid-March unemployment was estimated by State officials at 420,000 for the State and 230,000 for Detroit alone. The statewide figure was up 62,000 from mid-February. Current unemployment represents 14.3 percent of the labor force, 15.1 percent of Detroit's.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also invite the attention of Senators to a story appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Monday, March 24, 1958, which states:

Government economists are coming to the conclusion that business activity will begin to turn up slowly in the fourth quarter and not before.

This is an observation which the junior Senator from Minnesota has made previously, and which I believe has genuine merit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT ECONOMISTS NOW SEE NO UPTURN BEFORE LATE IN THE YEAR

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Government economists are coming to the conclusion that business activity will begin to turn up slowly in the fourth quarter and not before. Some of the gloomier seers think the rise may not begin until the first quarter of next year. And all the forecasters qualify their predictions by saying that all bets are off if there is no tax cut.

The recession now has gone further and is expected to last longer than any of the top economists anticipated just a few months ago.

The big, unforeseen trouble has been a sharp drop in automobile sales. Government economists expected the automobile manufacturers to have a good year and they are having a dismal one.

The forecasts of a fourth quarter rise turn partly upon expectations of an improvement in automobile activity when the 1959 models appear in dealer showrooms. If consumers cold-shoulder Detroit for the rest of this year, the economists say prospects of an upturn are very dim indeed.

The trouble that the experts have when they look for a turning point is that no one seems to be able to find a set of buying demands that will be strong enough to kick off a vigorous upsurge. That's why they all look for a slow rise when the advance begins.

State and local government spending for schools, hospitals, roads, and other facilities is expected to continue to climb slowly. So is Federal spending. And so, with any luck, is home building. Consumer spending, which has been tapering off, will pick up moderately if the 1959 models are attractive. But the downturn in business purchases of new plant and equipment that caused the slump is expected to continue—or, at best, to flatten out.

There's no spark in sight—no home-building boom as in 1954, no automobile buying jag as in 1955, no capital goods spending spree as in 1956 and 1957.

Guesses as to how long it will take to lift economic activity back to where it was at the end of 1957 range up to a year from the time the upturn begins. That could mean late 1959 or early 1960.

The most disheartening feature of the current situation has been the absence of substantial price cuts. Price reductions customarily are a key part of a recession adjustment and the economists figure that there's nothing that would whet business and consumer appetites more than a round of price slashes.

But prices have been holding firm. There's now a worrisome suspicion among the experts that this will be remembered as the recession that was ended by Government tax cuts and other moves—as the recession that was marked by about as many price maladjustments at the end as there had been at the beginning.

If the forebodings of the experts prove correct, it's a safe bet that the fourth postwar recession will follow closely on the heels of the current dip.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the serious effect of the recession upon the Minnesota iron-ore industry is reported in the New York Times of March 23. I have just returned from my State, and I can assure Senators that the situation in the iron-ore section in Minnesota is approaching very tragic and serious proportions. Unemployment today is heavier than it has been for years—since the early 1930's.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred, from the New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES IRON-ORE MARKET SQUEEZED BY STEEL SLUMP, RISE IN IMPORTS

MINNEAPOLIS, March 22.—Sagging steel production and growing imports of foreign ores have fashioned a pincers movement that threatens this year's market for domestic iron ore.

An aggravating factor is the existence of a record stockpile of unused ore at Lake Erie docks and at furnace yards served by Lake Superior mines. The stockpile on December 1 was 72 million tons, largest in history. Two months later it had declined by only 10 million tons, and ore consumption during February was 7 percent lower than in January.

Two winters ago ore furnaces gnawed so hungrily at 64-million-ton stockpile that by May 1, when the Great Lakes opened to spring shipping, the reserve had dropped to 27 million tons.

Lake Superior's iron range shipped 86 million tons of ore last year, 13 million tons below the record 1953 shipments of 99 million tons.

R. T. Elstad, of Duluth, Minn., president of the Oliver Iron Mining division of the United States Steel Corp., predicted a month ago that his company's output might be reduced as much as a third this year.

The Lake Superior mines in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan and in two Canadian areas, have furnished the bulk of this Nation's iron ore for the last half century.

Rich veins in Labrador and Quebec and in Venezuela, Chile, and Liberia last year accounted for most of the record imports of 30 million tons.

In January, imports were higher than for the same month in 1957. There has been no indication that United States concerns that own and operate many of the foreign facilities plan to cut back their imports.

On Minnesota's iron range, as a consequence, local officials of the United Steelworkers of America have been talking more and more of tariffs and quotas on imported ore. The Duluth unit of the AFL–CIO recently demanded, contrary to national labor policy, an end to reciprocal trade agreements.

A 10-percent reduction in steel output is forecast for 1958 by many in the industry. Such a cut could mean that ore production might fall below the 71 million tons produced in 1949, a postwar low.

Minnesota's tax revenues will suffer in the coming fiscal year if ore production falls off drastically. In February the number of jobs in Minnesota's ore mines and taconite plants stood at 14,600. About half the decline of 6,000 jobs since last September was seasonal, the other half attributable to an unfavorable outlook for steel production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, despite the seriousness of the recession, the administration maintains its wait-and-see position on a tax cut. As I stated to Senators on March 6, I believe that a tax cut is needed now to stimulate purchasing power, especially in the low- and middle-income families.

I also add, Mr. President, I stated in late January, when the first signs of the depth of this recession were appearing, that a tax cut was needed. I recall that day, because the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was addressing himself to the overall subject matter of the weakness in the housing and construction field, referring to the weakness of market conditions. During that discussion I engaged in a colloquy with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and pointed out my firm conviction that what was needed was not merely a step-up in construction and a coordinated activity on the part of the Federal, State and local governments in the field of public works, but also a sizable tax cut which would act as a stimulant to purchasing power.

I also believe that the date for the tax cut should be certain. There should be a date for it to go into effect, and a cut-off date, so that the tax schedule would return to the higher factor once the effectiveness of the tax cut has been shown.

I say that in relationship to the tax schedule, and not with respect to excise taxes. It is my view that the excise taxes are retrogressive. It is my view that they have a very injurious effect upon the economy, and that not only should they be reduced, but many of them which are retrogressive and injurious to the health of the economy should be repealed.

I was pleased to read this past weekend that the President's former economic adviser, Dr. Arthur Burns, recommends an immediate, broadly based tax cut. I referred to Dr. Burns' philosophy on the recession and how to cope with it in my speech on March 6. I read from Dr. Burns' book entitled, "Prosperity Without Inflation," and quoted in considerable measure from the recommendations of Dr. Arthur Burns, who, as we all know, was formerly economic adviser to the President. I recommend to my colleagues in the Senate as "must" reading the articles or lectures of Dr. Burns, which are published in the book to which I have referred, entitled, "Prosperity Without Inflation." In that book, which represents a collection of a series of lectures, Dr. Burns not only recommends a tax cut, but underscores the importance of timing in whatever we do. He points out that Government action in combating the recession is effective in direct proportion to the time the action is taken and the degree and extent of the action.

I have previously recommended that the President of the United States make a determined effort to consult with other representatives of government at the State and local level. I think we must clearly understand that if we are to combat the effects of this recession we cannot afford to have State and local governments withdrawing from their obligations or their plans for construction and economic progress, relying upon the Federal Government to do it alone.

There must be closely coordinated teamwork between Federal, State, and local governments in whatever public-works programs are undertaken, and whatever construction programs are undertaken.

Therefore I have recommended, and continue to recommend that the President call an immediate conference of the governors of the 48 States, first of all, to get their recommendations and

their observations on what is going on in their respective jurisdictions; and secondly, for the President to inform the governors that there needs to be, and that he will see to it that there will be, the closest type of cooperation and coordination between the Federal Government and State governments.

The same thing must be done in the case of the mayors of the major cities. The great municipalities of America and their governing bodies and officials must be called upon by the President to continue their works programs, their construction programs, and not be cutting off at a time when we are asking Congress to make appropriations to stimulate public works.

I refer to airport development, hospital construction, school construction, construction of sewage-disposal plants; streets, parks, and all the many areas of public works and public construction which are today found in the municipalities, counties, and States.

All these programs need to be coordinated with the Federal program, and the Federal program needs to add a genuine stimulus to those efforts.

This is the philosophy of Dr. Arthur Burns. Dr. Burns points out the importance of doing what needs to be done soon enough so that it will be effective. Delay will be costly.

One sure way to a Federal Government deficit is to permit this recession to grow deeper. One way of getting out of the recession is to have the courage to take the action which is required now, rather than delaying it. I believe that such action requires not only public works in the field of hospital construction, sewage disposal plant construction, recreational areas, housing, needed public buildings, and conservation efforts in our forests and national parks, but also emergency school construction and other emergency construction. We ought to move forthrightly and quickly into the field of emergency school construction. I hope the committees of Congress which have before them a large number of bills dealing with Federal aid to school construction will take affirmative action, and take it quickly. If there is any one area of public endeavor in which we ought to fulfill our obligation, it is in the field of school construction.

I hope that a sense of urgency about an emergency program will be manifest in the Congress.

I would add to that the tax cut which is being recommended by such responsible men as Dr. Arthur Burns and others. Dr. Burns said that—

> If we delay more than a very few weeks, in the hope that economic recovery will come on its own by midyear, we shall be taking the risk of having to resort later to drastic action.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks Dr. Burns' statement, as contained in an article from the New York Times with relation thereto.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIDE TAX CUT NOW IS URGED BY BURNS—FORMER CHIEF OF PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC ADVISERS CALLS FOR $5 BILLION SLASH

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, March 22.—Dr. Arthur F. Burns said today that the end of the recession was not yet in sight and called for an immediate, broadly based, permanent $5 billion tax cut.

Dr. Burns also urged improvement in the unemployment-insurance system, more flexibility in the highway construction program and the enactment by law of a national anti-inflation policy.

Dr. Burns is professor of economics at Columbia University and president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc. From 1953–55 he was Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. He spoke at the annual University of Chicago Management Conference in the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

Dr. Burns told an audience of 1,000 Chicago businessmen and economists that "my only hope is that he will not take too long in seeking the perfection which we shall not find."

URGES PROMPT ACTION

Prompt action, he said, would create an excellent prospect of reversing the economic tide. He continued:

"If, on the other hand, we delay more than a very few weeks, in the hope that economic recovery will come on its own by midyear, we shall be taking the risk of having to resort later to drastic medicine."

Before his talk, Dr. Burns told a reporter he wanted to stress the need for action now that would not only combat the recession but also avoid inflationary effects later.

In his speech Dr. Burns laid great stress on a proposed amendment to the 1946 Employment Act, which laid down as a national policy that the Government has an obligation to nurture maximum employment and production.

"It would therefore be wise," he asserted, "to accompany any early tax reduction by a national declaration of purpose with regard to the general level of prices that could have a moral force such as the employment act already exercises with regard to our levels of production and employment."

INFLATION FEAR A FACTOR

The fear that governmental economic stimulants might cause inflation is a frequent theme among business leaders.

Asked whether he had discussed his points with anyone in the administration, Dr. Burns said he preferred not to answer lest he cause embarrassment.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON told a press conference here Thursday: "I think as far as the tax cut is concerned, it is not timely to make it now."

Dr. Burns said that although the recession was in its eighth month, business and consumer confidence had not yet been seriously impaired and that was precisely the element of strength to preserve.

He also warned that should the recession deepen it would provide propaganda for the Soviet Union.

He ruled out as unrealistic any significant economic effects in the immediate future from even a massive public-works program because it would take too long. The effect might be felt, Dr. Burns argued, just when the economy was under inflationary pressure again.

"A tax reduction is clearly a sounder method of dealing with a mild recession," he argued.

WOULD INCLUDE BUSINESS

He said it should apply to high as well as low incomes and to businesses as well as individuals so it would stimulate investment as well as consumption and be free of time restrictions limiting it to months or years.

Dr. Burns said that lower tax rates would soon be offset in considerable part by increased collections and he also argued that it would put a damper on later increases in Federal spending and thus generate less inflationary pressures in the future than a public-works program of the same size.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I entered the Chamber just as the Senator was referring to the article by Dr. Burns, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Today, at the beginning of the morning hour, I had the opportunity to refer to the March issue of Economic Indicators. A copy of this document is, of course, available to every Member of Congress. I recommend that the Senator consult the March issue. He will find there, in the testimony of the statisticians of the Government, through the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee, the statistical facts which show that the trend of the entire economy is downward, but prices are still rising.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read the brief news dispatch in the morning press on that subject. Of course, the report of the Economic Indicators would be much more detailed. This, again, is one of those ironical and paradoxical situations, in which we see the economy as a whole suffering from deflation, in terms of the recession, but the price structure of the vast number of administered prices is going up, which is the story of inflation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is a point in that connection which should be especially emphasized. When the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary had before it representatives of the big steel companies, among them former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, the latter was asked why the steel companies did not reduce the price of steel, in view of the conditions which plainly existed, and the existence of which he acknowledged. His response was that his company was unwilling to reduce prices. Last week the Secretary of the Army announced that his Department was about to award $100 million worth of contracts for the building of vehicles of various kinds.

The Chrysler Corp. is to be one of the recipients of some of these contracts. The Government will be paying the higher prices of steel. There is no reason why the former Secretary of the Treasury and his company should not help the executive branch of the Government to fight inflation and the recession by reducing the price of the steel that goes into the commodities which the Government must buy with borrowed money, on which it is paying an increased rate of interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to my colleagues in the Senate that I always feel better when I know that the able and brilliant Senator from Wyoming inter-

ests himself and continues to interest himself in our economy.

As a student, some years ago, I read the splendid reports issued by the Temporary National Economic Committee, which are monumental contributions to the understanding of the corporate structure in the American economy and the economic factors which are at work. We are deeply and eternally indebted to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

I was also pleased to see that the highly respected Committee for Economic Development urges a 20-percent tax cut if the recession deepens in March and April. The antirecession program of the CED merits careful consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the story on the CED proposals as reported in the New York Times of March 23 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS GROUP ASKS 20-PERCENT TAX CUT IF SLUMP WIDENS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT UNIT URGES ACROSS-BOARD SLASH IN PERSONAL INCOME LEVY—NIXON ASSURES NATION—SAYS ADMINISTRATION IS "ON TOP" OF SITUATION AND WON'T TOLERATE A LONG DIP

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The Committee for Economic Development recommended today a temporary 20-percent across-the-board reduction in personal income taxes if the recession deepens in March and April.

The recommendation came in a policy statement by an 8-man panel of the privately supported research committee of 150 businessmen and educators. The Committee for Economic Development has always backed large budget deficits to cure recessions.

Meanwhile, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON told reporters that the Eisenhower administration had not yet made a choice between tax relief and major public works expenditures as a possible weapon to combat the recession.

ACTION IS PLEDGED

With considerable emphasis, however, Mr. NIXON asserted that the American people could be assured that the administration was "on top of the economic situation" and would not tolerate a prolonged economic downturn.

[In Chicago, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, urged an immediate $5 billion-a-year tax cut.]

A tax cut should be enacted, the Committee for Economic Development said, if seasonably adjusted industrial production, employment and personal income continue to decline through April.

The cut would automatically expire March 31, 1959.

The group also urged a more aggressive easy money policy by the Federal Reserve System and some speeding up of various Government-spending programs in cases where "the major impact upon the economy of doing so will be felt within a year or so."

LIMITED EFFECT FORECAST

The report stressed, however, that "rescheduling of public-works projects can of themselves make only a limited contribution to quick reversal of a downward trend of the gross national product"—the sum of all goods and services—and that "increases in Government expenditures should not be our chief reliance."

The committee is a highly respected economic research organization. It is nonprofit and nonpolitical. Donald K. David, chairman of the CED and chairman of the Ford Foundation's Executive Committee, is a member of the committee that wrote today's report. The CED was founded in 1942 by a group that included Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; William Benton, former Democratic Senator from Connecticut, Paul G. Hoffman, former administrator of foreign aid, and Wayne C. Taylor, former Under Secretary of Commerce.

The report set up the following three criteria for a tax cut:

1. The aim is to halt a recession, "not to change the burden of taxation or to reform the tax structure." Hence it should be "neutral" with respect to the existing tax distribution, affecting everyone's total income-tax bill, including withholding levies. "Such a cut," the report said, "would provide a quick spur to consumption expenditures."

2. It should be prompt if the economy continues to slide and should be temporary to avoid "a pronounced risk of inflation in the ensuing business advance."

3. "The size of the tax cut must be commensurate with the size of the problem." This would mean a personal income-tax cut at a yearly rate of $7,500,000,000, or 20 percent of the $38 billion that the income tax would bring in under conditions of prosperity.

The actual tax loss would be less because the 20 percent would apply to a recession income base, because the tax cut could be expected to increase incomes as prosperity returned, and because the cut would not be in effect for a full year.

The report said the group "does not claim that the program presented in this statement would immediately and exactly restore the economy to high employment and production; the time and pace of recovery will depend upon the decisions and actions of private consumers and producers."

"The influence of Government can stimulate and supplement private behavior but not displace it," the report stressed.

The group cited figures showing that the recession had gone as far as the declines in 1948–49 and 1953–54. In arguing that some further decline would be necessary to warrant major action, it said:

"We do not wish to fire our heaviest antidepression artillery each time business activity slackens, simply because we fear future economic collapse."

Such a policy, it said, would make inflation unavoidable.

The report also urged that the Government base its decision on actual figures on the performance of the economy, necessarily somewhat delayed, rather than forecasts of how the economy would go.

The signers of today's report were Frazer B. Wilde, chairman, president of Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; Donald K. David, chairman of the executive committee of the Ford Foundation; William C. Foster, executive vice president of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.; Howard C. Peterson, president of Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.; Berdsley Rummi, economist of New York; George F. Smith, president of Johnson & Johnson, surgical goods manufacturers; Allan Sproul, retired president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and J. Cameron Thomson, chairman of the board of Northwest Bancorporation of Minneapolis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the CED's policy statement on the recession as reported in the New York Times of March 23, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ANTIRECESSION PROGRAM OF COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE ECONOMY

The current decline in business activity is one of the long series in the wavelike movement that has been characteristic of our economic growth. Most previous business declines in our history have been moderate and brief, with the downward movement ending within a year, recovery substantially completed within 2 years and the trough in the Nation's output not more than a few percent below the previous peak. The recessions of 1949 and 1954 were of this character. We have had only a few depressions that were both very deep and prolonged; those beginning in 1837, 1873, 1893, and 1929 are the only ones that really qualify for this description. Their extreme character stemmed largely from the collapse of the financial system and the wholesale destruction of confidence that such a collapse engendered. Institutional changes in the financial system since 1929 provide a guaranty against financial collapse and, along with other changes, warrant our belief that there will not be a future depression on the scale of the thirties. We have also had a certain number of depressions of intermediate character, such as those that started in 1920 and 1937. We have done a good deal to make such pronounced dips less likely, but we cannot be sure that we will not have to deal with them again.

DECLINES RECOUNTED

In February 1958 employment in nonagricultural establishments, seasonally adjusted, was 1,700,000, or 3.2 percent lower than in the previous August. In the same period, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate rose from 4.2 percent of the civilian labor force to 6.7 percent. Short hours became more prevalent. The gross national product, seasonally adjusted at annual rates, dropped from $440 billion in the third quarter of 1957, when the economy was operating at high employment, to $432,500,000,000 in the fourth. If allowance is made for both the subsequent decline and the fact that prices had risen, it is likely that by February the real gross national product, which measures the total production of the economy, was about 3½ percent below the 1957 third quarter. But with normal growth of the economy's productive capacity, we would now be able to produce about 1½ percent more than in the third quarter of 1957. This would indicate that in February the economy was operating at about 95 percent of the high-employment level, if gross national product in the third quarter of 1957 is taken as a standard. The decline in employment and production was not slackening.

OTHER FACTORS NOTED

This, in broad terms, is where we stand as this is written. Certain important characteristics of the decline thus far should also be pointed out. Consumer expenditures for nondurable goods and services, together, which in 1957 absorbed 56 percent of the entire gross national product, have held up well. "This is significant, because an outstanding characteristic of the declining phase of major depressions is a general downward spiral of consumer income and consumer spending. Thus far in the present recession the decline in spending has not become general, and such a cumulative spiral is not in process. It should also be noted that purchasing by State and local governments is continuing to rise; Federal Government spending is scheduled to turn up a little, and the movement of residential construction activity continues irregular rather than clearly upward or downward.

The impact of the recession thus far has been principally upon employment and production in durable goods manufacturing. Employment in mining, construction, transportation, and nondurable goods manufacturing has been affected to a lesser extent. In other industrial divisions, employment has declined only slightly or increased.

SIMILARITIES FOUND

Despite important differences in the forces initiating declines in 1948, 1953, and 1957, the magnitude and most general characteristics of the 1957–58 decline are similar to the patterns of the 1948–49 and 1953–54 recessions after they had been in process for the same length of time. However, they are also similar to the pattern we should expect in the early stages of a more serious decline if we make allowance for the support provided to consumer income by automatic stabilizers, such as unemployment insurance, that have been introduced since we last experienced such a decline.

If the probabilities are that the amplitude and duration of the 1958 recession will be similar to those of its immediate predecessors, it is mainly because most recessions are of such a moderate character. That we do not know what will bring a reversal does not mean that it will not appear—any more than the outstanding sales success of the 1955 model automobiles that accelerated recovery in late 1954 could be foreseen with assurance earlier in that year. But we must also reckon with the possibility that we are in the early stages of a more serious decline. The most likely cause would be the same as in many such periods in the past—a pronounced and prolonged slide in the rate of business investment in plant and equipment, without sufficiently strong offsets in other types of demand. Reinforced by a further drop in foreign sales and by a rise in the rate of business inventory liquidation, a sharp slide in business capital outlays could curtail consumer income enough to set in motion the characteristic downward spiral of consumer income and spending, the hallmark of depression.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE NOW?

1. Monetary policy: A main reliance for support of the economy in the present situation should be monetary policy.

Monetary policy influences private spending through its effect on the supply of money and the cost and availability of credit. Individuals and businesses tend to spend more if they have easier access to credit, if the cost of borrowing declines and if they find themselves holding more cash and other liquid assets in relation to their needs.

All of these factors depend to a great extent on Federal Reserve policies, since the Reserve System can make credit more readily available at lower cost by increasing the reserves of the commercial banking system. It can do this by buying Government securities in the open market or by reducing the reserves the member banks are required to hold against their deposits and it can lower the interest rate at which banks can borrow reserves from the regional Federal Reserve banks. These actions increase the lending capacity of banks and reduce the cost of borrowing and this, in turn, will tend to stimulate the banks to lend more readily to qualified borrowers at favorable interest rates and will thus help to increase private expenditures.

VIGOROUS ACTION URGED

The Federal Reserve System should move even more vigorously to provide the banks with abundant reserves. The reserve position of the banks should be adequate not only to permit them to meet all sound loan demands that come to them but also to impel them to seek to make additional sound loans and acquire other assets. The small decline in the money supply (seasonally adjusted) that has occurred since mid-1957 should be halted and reversed. We believe that monetary policy is most effective when it is used wholeheartedly. Obviously, we cannot prescribe the precise timing of the necessary steps or the magnitude of reserves that should be supplied. Such decisions must be made by the Federal Reserve on the basis of day-to-day developments.

2. Federal budget policy: In a recession, Federal tax receipts tend to fall and unemployment compensation payments, social security pensions, public assistance payments and other expenditures increase. These automatic responses to recession are stabilizing because they cushion the decline in incomes that individuals and businesses have available to spend.

The Federal budget should be permitted to exercise its normal, stabilizing effect on the economy—an effect that is far stronger than at any time prior to World War II. This means that if, as is to be expected, tax receipts drop below those estimated in the President's budget because of lower incomes, we should not try to make up the deficiency in receipts by raising tax rates or by lowering expenditures.

In addition, some acceleration of Government expenditures planned for the near future under existing authorized and necessary programs is appropriate.

To get the stabilizing effect of the budget principle we recommend it is necessary that in a recession the budget be allowed to run a deficit as tax revenues drop and certain expenditures automatically rise. In the coming year—fiscal year 1959—tax receipts are very likely to fall below the budget estimate, mainly because individual and corporate incomes are likely to be lower than was assumed in the tax forecasts. If this happens, the debt limit should not force the Government to reduce its spending precisely when the economy needs the stimulating effect of a Government deficit and when provision for national security demands increasing defense outlays. To avoid these undesirable consequences, the debt limit should be raised by an amount that would allow not only for ordinary seasonal variation in receipts in the coming year, but also for the possibility that expenditures for the entire year will substantially exceed receipts. In our view, the $5 billion temporary increase already enacted is too small, in view of the uncertainties on both the receipts and expenditures sides of the budget, even on the assumption that the recession will be moderate in extent and duration.

3. Planning stronger action: Additional measures to be used if the recession deepens should be readied and agreed upon now. This is necessary so that action may be taken quickly if it is needed. It will also provide a solid basis for confidence on the part of the businessmen, investors, and consumers that there will be no deep depression. Hence it will prevent fear and uncertainty from holding up investment and consumer spending and make it more likely that recovery will be achieved by natural forces assisted by the measures suggested above.

CONDITIONS WARRANTING STRONGER ACTION

It would be unwise to set up a single rigid signal for strong antirecession action, but we believe such action would be appropriate if the economic decline passes the low points reached in 1949 and 1954.

We suggest that this would be the case if, after allowance for seasonal influences, business activity continues to contract for another 2 months, after February, unless there is unmistakable evidence of quickly forthcoming improvement.

Any significant decline in total consumer spending for nondurable goods and services, accompanying a pronounced drop in disposable personal income, would also suggest the need for strong counteraction, since, as indicated earlier, it would suggest the beginning of a downward spiral of income and spending generally that, if unchecked, could cause the decline to snowball.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE IF THE RECESSION DEEPENS

Circumstances described in the previous section would call for an economic policy that has a good probability of stopping the business decline and turning activity upward; half measures that merely slow the downward movement would not then meet our national objective. Subject to this criterion, we should also continue to use measures that do not interfere with adjustments in resource allocation, relative prices and costs through normal competitive processes and that are quickly reversible. The latter criterion, however, may be interpreted somewhat more loosely, since we shall be starting with more idle resources and less immediate danger of reviving inflationary pressures.

RESCHEDULING GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Under conditions calling for strong Federal action, the Federal Government should make every effort to accelerate necessary procurement and public works, but only when the major impact upon the economy of so doing will be felt within a year or so. This allows more scope for rescheduling than the narrower program we have suggested for the present situation, but is nonetheless a severe restriction. If it is not met, procurement and public-works acceleration will not only be ineffective in helping to check recession but may later add to inflationary problems.

The increase of expenditures in order to fight recession can easily become wasteful unless discrimination is exercised. While a speedup of expenditures that would otherwise have to be made later is warranted, embarking upon unnecessary projects is both extravagant at the time and likely to lead to a continuing scale of Government expenditures larger than would be adopted were programs considered strictly on their merits. Acceleration of contract terms so much that costs are increased by overtime work at time and one-half or double time, or by wasteful production and buying practices, is also to be avoided. The Government should obtain more, not less, for its dollars in periods of slack business.

Acceleration of procurement and public works, together, can and should play a supporting role in bringing about recovery. State and local governments, by accelerating their programs in the manner suggested here for the Federal Government, could also make a contribution. But increases in Government expenditures should not be our chief reliance.

A LARGE TEMPORARY TAX CUT

The major emphasis should be upon temporary and substantial reduction in Federal income taxes to raise private incomes and hence to increase consumer spending and business investment. The tax cut should have three principal characteristics:

1. The purpose of the tax cut is to help lift us out of a recession, not to change the burden of taxation or to reform the tax structure. Consequently, it should be neutral with respect to the distribution of the tax burden. A flat percentage reduction in the income tax bills of individuals applied to the amounts computed under existing law would meet this criterion sufficiently well. Such a tax reduction would provide a quick spur to consumption expenditures. It should also help to restore opportunities for profitable investments, mainly by the improvement of business sales though also by di-

rectly increasing net yields to individual investors.

2. If the conditions we have assumed appear, the tax cut should be prompt. It should also be put into effect for a limited time only, with automatic provision for a return to the previous rates. This is essential to permit enough tax reduction to stimulate recovery and yet not run a pronounced risk of inflation in the ensuing business advance.

3. The size of the tax cut must be commensurate with the size of the problem. If the situation we describe should develop within the next few months, the real gross national product would have fallen something like 4½ percent from its previous peak. Over the intervening period estimated normal growth at a rate of 3 percent a year would have increased the productive capacity of the economy by more than 2 percent. Our gross national product, consequently, would probably be nearly 7 percent below a high employment level. This amounts to an annual rate of about $30 billion in gross national product.

We suggest the tax cut should aim to provide a stimulus that would provide the basis for quickly eliminating the larger part of the gap between actual and potential production. The immediate effects would be mainly to raise private consumption and, as a result of the strengthening of business sales, to check inventory liquidation. Some additional stimulus would be provided by the temporarily higher rate of Federal purchases we urge above. Together, the effects of these actions should strengthen investment generally, and impart an upward impetus to the economy that would set us on the road back to high employment.

Although a precise calculation is impossible, we believe that this objective requires a personal income tax cut at a yearly rate of about $7,500,000,000, when yields are computed on the basis of income levels consistent with high employment and stable prices. Present personal income tax rates would yield about $38 billion a year under conditions of high employment and price stability, so that would mean a cut of one-fifth in these taxes. A much larger reduction would carry too great a risk of inflation; one much smaller would have an insufficiently high probability of success.

COST TO TREASURY

The actual cost to the Treasury of such a temporary tax cut should be less than $7,500,000,000. First, because the actual income base to which it was applied would be below the high employment level; under the assumed conditions the tax loss initially would be at an annual rate of about $7 billion. Second, because we would expect the reduction to be in effect, at least in full, for less than a year. Third, because, under conditions of substantial unemployment, the stimulus of the tax reduction should raise the tax base well above what it would be in its absence—without the corresponding increase in government cost resulting from inflation that would ensue from a similar policy under high employment conditions.

We recommend that, if such a temporary tax cut becomes necessary, its original enactment should be for a period ending March 31, 1959. Tax withholdings, which account for the bulk of individual income tax collections, would be immediately reduced by one-fifth. Individuals making taxpayments on current-year incomes would recompute their liabilities and adjust their current payments. The tax liability on the final returns for the year would be computed in the usual fashion, but with the addition of a line for the "emergency antirecession tax reduction." This would be equal to the ordinary tax liability multiplied by one-fifth the fraction of the year for which the reduction was in effect. If, for example, the reduction were effective on July 1, 1958, and ended on March 31, 1959, the deduction on calendar-year returns for 1958 would be equal to 10 percent of the originally computed liability and for 1959 to 5 percent.

CUTOFF PROPOSED

To meet the objective of high employment without inflation—and to justify the use of taxation in any similar future situation—it is essential that the temporary tax cut be pared or eliminated as quickly as the recovery of the economy warrants.

If this more vigorous action becomes necessary and is taken boldly, there is reason for confidence that tax reduction on the scale we have recommended, supported by rescheduling of Federal expenditures and expansionary monetary policy, will succeed in turning the economy upward. Given the necessary determination, it should also be feasible to reverse action quickly enough to prevent the stage from being set for another round of inflation.

The CED research and policy committee has repeatedly recommended reduction in the corporate profits tax and in selective excise taxes as part of the long-run reform of the Federal tax structure. We urge consideration of these and other desirable tax reforms at the earliest possible time. We omit them from the proposed antirecession tax program only because of our desire to concentrate on the simplest step on which quick agreement would be most readily forthcoming. We believe that reduction of individual income taxes would be an effective way of stimulating an increase in private spending, with resulting increased employment, until expansionary forces within the private economy reassert themselves.

DISTINCTION IS MADE

We cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of distinguishing clearly between temporary measures to deal with the recession and permanent changes in public policy. This distinction will make prompt and effective action both more feasible and less dangerous. The possibility of agreeing quickly on emergency measures will be greatly enhanced if there is also agreement that these measures are for the duration of the emergency only. In particular, it should be much easier to agree upon a generally acceptable tax cut to last for a short period than to agree upon a broad and permanent revision of Federal tax policy with all the complications that entails.

Moreover, the danger that emergency measures would persist into conditions when they would be inappropriate—when they would be inflationary, wasteful, or inconsistent with long-term growth—would also be reduced by prior understanding of their temporary character and by advance provision for their termination. One implication of this is that we must all resist the temptation to use the recession as an occasion for trying to fasten permanent changes upon Federal policy with respect to expenditures, taxes, or anything else. Permanent changes should be considered in the light of the expected long-run condition of our economy, which is not a condition of recession.

We also wish to warn against the danger of basing policy primarily on forecasts of the future rather than on present facts. Forecasts of the short-term course of employment and business are guesses that cannot be continuously correct, so that any action based upon them may be wrong. Moreover, agreement can rarely be reached on forecasts of the future. Hence, if effective policy action depends upon forecasts, we may do the wrong thing or do things too soon or too late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, more and more people are asking why the administration does not face up to this recession. How much longer can it sit back with a wait-and-see attitude on a tax cut?

Mr. President, I may ask, also, what was it that dampened the ardor of the Vice President? Three weeks ago he seemed to be filled with urgency for a tax cut. Apparently since then his high desire has been moderated by some counsel or admonition from those in the administration who have been able to restrain what I thought was a commendable and helpful attitude on the part of the Vice President.

The Alsop brothers in the March 24 Washington Post give some very interesting answers to this question. I ask unanimous consent that their column entitled "Eventually, Why Not Now?" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVENTUALLY, WHY NOT NOW?

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

When the unencouraging preliminary figures for March employment and business activity were laid before the Cabinet last week, the response was gloomily impassive. This raises the puzzling question: "Eventually, why not now?"

Eventually, if the final returns on March are bad, the administration is heavily committed to a bold, business-stimulating tax cut. The President himself promised the country a March upturn only a few weeks ago.

Other leading figures of the Eisenhower team repeatedly have explained that we must wait and see the March outcome, and they have indicated that action to cut taxes would follow if the March outcome proved disappointing.

Virtually all the indices now suggest that the March outcome will be decidedly disappointing. New applications for unemployment relief have dropped fractionally. The month may well show a modest increase of persons having jobs—which the White House staff immediately will claim as justification of the President's incautious forecast.

But although the total of employed may rise, the figures already available almost surely mean that the crucial unemployment total will either hold about even or quite possibly rise, too. As family incomes are lowered by cuts in work hours, more and more housewives and young people are looking for jobs to keep pork chops on the family table.

Overall, the American economy looks like it is doing no better in March than in February, and there are some who say the curve is still downward in a month of normal seasonal pickup.

Unanimity among economists is never to be looked for. But there are not many Government economists who have not already delivered an unfavorable verdict on the month of March, except for men directly attached to the President's staff, like Gabriel Hauge.

The White House experts and some in the Treasury continue to argue that the economy's March performance can be judged only when all the statistics are finally available, in mid-April.

Maybe Hauge is right. Certainly, it is now the White House intention to stick to the wait-and-see line, at least until mid-April. Even Vice President NIXON, who was all for an immediate tax cut only 2 weeks ago,

has swung round to the case for wait-and-see. But the odds are clearly about 3 to 1 that when mid-April rolls around, the final returns on March will give the administration no choice but to take the promised action to cut taxes or openly to declare that taxcutting is not such a good remedy after all.

Therefore the question: "Eventually, why not now?" It has all the more force because any stimulant always is more effective if it is applied early, whether to an ailing economy or an ailing body. It is a really puzzling question, but it has an answer that comes in three parts.

In the first place, a big tax cut is a very big step, especially in view of the worsening foreign and defense situation, which may make heavy future demands on the economy. For that reason, if for no other, the key man on the President's advisory team, Treasury Secretary Robert Anderson, takes Hauge's line, not hostile to a tax cut if needed, but wanting all the evidence before the decision.

In the second place, there is an identifiable school of thought in the administration, probably stronger in the Federal Reserve Board than elsewhere, unkindly described as the "further through the wringer" school, in which inflation has been the great fear, all through the Eisenhower years.

The "further through the wringer" school holds that the current depression has simply got to be reflected in serious price cuts before it will be safe to take stimulating action with a naturally inflationary tendency, like a tax reduction. Otherwise, this school says, a stimulated upturn now will lead surely to a grave inflationary situation 2 years from now.

The third part of the answer is clearly the President himself. In the President's attitude, there are more than hints of the strong influence of his businessmen friends, many of whom have views about Government interference in the economy that do not differ greatly from former President Hoover's.

Then, too, as his reaction to the sputnik also showed, Dwight Eisenhower nowadays greatly prefers immobility to motion. The President is therefore the strongest defender of doing nothing now to lower taxes, even though it appears almost certain the tax-cut stimulant will have to be applied later.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Washington Post of last Saturday reports:

While industrial output in the United States has been dropping rapidly during the current recession, the industrial ouput of the Soviet Union has been surging upward at an equally rapid pace.

The hardship to so many millions of Americans that is taking place as a result of this recession is bad enough in itself. But to make matters even worse, this recession is jeopardizing the position of the Free World in its struggle against the totalitarian forces led by the Soviet Union.

Let us consider for a moment what has been happening. While our own industrial production this year is running 10 percent lower than a year ago, the Soviet Union's production is up by 11 percent for the same period. And this rate of growth in the Soviet Union is typical of what they have been doing in recent years and plan to do in years to come.

If the United States is to retain its position as the leader of the Free World, Mr. President, it is imperative that we have a strong economy which is reflected in steady productive growth.

Unfortunately in the past 5 years we have not had a steady productive growth. As a matter of fact, industrial production at the present time is less than it was a full 5 years ago despite our increased productive capacity and booming population growth.

Mr. President, I was shocked when I read this statement, which has been checked very carefully, and which was underscored in the Washington Post article, namely, that the industrial production in the United States is less than it was a full 5 years ago, despite increased productive capacity and a booming population growth.

In 1953 the industrial production index averaged 134, in 1954 it dropped to 125, in 1955 it rose to 139, in 1956 it rose to 143, in 1957 it stood still, and for the first 2 months of this year it has averaged only 131½.

It would indeed be tragic if the Soviet Union were to win the balance of power due to our failure to maintain our advantage in production.

That is why the recession is even more important than the tragedy that befalls us at home, which is the tragedy of waste of manpower and productive facilities, and unemployment. There is a challenge every bit as great, and that is the challenge of the balance of power in the world shifting into the hands of the Soviet Union because of industrial progress.

This is a very real possibility unless the administration realistically faces up to the facts of life, tears up its chins-up speeches, rolls up its sleeves and begins to demonstate a capacity for intelligent leadership as demanded by the American people and the Free World at large.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article to which I have referred entitled "Recession Helps Russians Narrow Production Gap," from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 22, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECESSION HELPS RUSSIANS NARROW PRODUCTION GAP

(By Thomas P. Whitney)

While industrial output in the United States has been dropping rapidly during the current recession, the industrial output of the Soviet Union has been surging upward at an equally rapid pace.

The result is that the Russians are swiftly narrowing the big gap between industrial production of the Soviet Union and that of the United States.

American industrial output in January and February 1958, was approximately 10 percent lower than it was in the same 2 months of 1957, according to the Federal Reserve Index.

An official communique of the Central Statistical Administration of the Soviet Government placed Soviet industrial production in January and February 1958 at 11 percent higher than in the same period of 1957.

TYPICAL OF RUSSIAN RATE

This figure of 10 or 11 percent annual increase is typical of the rate at which Russian industrial production is being increased each year currently.

Experts on the Soviet economy have estimated that, roughly, the Soviet Union may at present have about half as large a total industrial production as the United States. Nikita Khrushchev estimated a few months ago that it would take the Soviet Union 15 years, more or less, to reach the American industrial output of 1957.

Soviet leaders are obviously watching with great interest the American recession. Khrushchev himself demonstrated this when he devoted a full 10 minutes of his election speech on March 14 to the report by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, delivered at the recent AFL–CIO put-America-back-to-work rally.

Following this speech Soviet papers devoted much attention to the Meany report, which described declining production and rising unemployment. in America.

TASK WOULD BE EASIER

Otherwise the Soviet press has not been devoting any tremendous amount of attention to the American recession in the last few weeks.

In the unlikely event the American industrial decline should continue for several years, the task which the Soviet Union has set for itself of catching up with American industrial production would be much easier and take fewer years than the Soviet leaders have been thinking it might.

Therefore, one can be sure that, despite the seeming lack of intense interest by the Soviet press in American economic troubles, Khrushchev and his colleagues in the Kremlin are following them closely. And, no doubt, they are quite pleased by the bad business news in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I conclude my remarks on the subject of the recession by saying that our foreign aid bill is in trouble and that our foreign trade bill is in trouble. They are going to be in trouble until the administration and Congress lay down an antirecession program which gives our people a sense of confidence. The American people are taking a dim view of foreign aid and loans to foreign countries and grants to foreign nations, even when those countries are our closest friends, and even when they know they are our trusted allies, so long as the American people find they are unable to get jobs and unable to do the things that are needed to be done in their communities.

If the administration wishes to save the foreign aid program—and I surely do, and I shall support it—it will have to take some effective steps. Mr. President, I shall support it despite the fact that 90 percent of the mail that comes to my office is opposed to foreign aid. The latest check this morning reveals the fact that 9 out of every 10 letters that I have received on the subject of foreign aid and mutual security are in opposition; that 8 out of every 10 on the subject of reciprocal trade are in opposition. Despite that fact, it is my sincere belief that both measures are urgently needed. I shall support them.

However, I say that unless the administration is willing to take effective and forthright and timely action to stop the recession and give our people a sense of confidence, and give our people an opportunity to work, and put men back on the jobs, and restore industrial capacity and industrial production, there is going to be a tragic failure in America in the field of foreign policy and in the field of foreign aid.

Today our mutual security program and our foreign trade program rest on a precarious balance, and can be tipped over at any time to such an extent that the foreign aid program will be cut to ribbons, and the foreign trade program will be filled with protectionist philosophy.

I hope and pray that that will not happen. One sure way to stop it is for the administration to get away from the nonsense of its chins-up talk, and to get down to the practical case of getting the necessary work done. This means the construction of housing and hospitals and schools, and the raising of unemployment compensation, and it means an expanded social-security program, in which the benefits are commensurate with the cost of living.

It means that the President of the United States should sign the farm measure, Senate Joint Resolution 162, which we have put on his desk. He should sign the measure which will make certain that farm prices will not fall any further. He must not veto it, because to do so will be to serve warning on the farm population of America that their lot is not to be considered; that their economic situation is to be ignored. If that kind of action follows, if there is a veto, an outcry from the rural areas of America will take its toll upon effective foreign aid programs and effective foreign aid.

As a friend to foreign aid and foreign trade, I appeal to the President to exercise his leadership to give to the Nation reassurance that we are just as willing to lend money to the municipalities of the Nation to repair their water systems and sewage disposal systems as we are to make loans to other nations; reassurance that the United States Government is as willing to help our own people obtain jobs by effective action as it is to provide economic opportunities to the people in other parts of the world.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is the Senator aware of the statistical argument in support of his position, as revealed in the New York Times this morning? Every Monday, for a long period of years, the New York Times has been printing a list of the maturities of the United States Government which must be refinanced within the next 12 months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am interested to know about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Here is an amazing story. The 1-year maturities amount to $82,206,530,641. They are the United States Treasury obligations in the hands of the public, and they will mature within the next 12 months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article containing the list of Treasury securities be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-YEAR MATURITIES ARE $82,206,530,641

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to $82,206,530,641. They consist of Treasury securities as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mar. 24—Tax antic. bills | $3,001,664,000 |
| Mar. 27—Discount bills | 1,700,152,000 |
| Apr. 1—Ser. E sav. bonds[1] | 2,291,394,146 |
| Apr. 1—Ser. F sav. bonds[1] | 172,987,637 |
| Apr. 1—Ser. G sav. bonds[1] | 1,306,651,700 |
| Apr. 1—1½% Treas. notes | 49,715,000 |
| Apr. 3—Discount bills | 1,700,340,000 |
| Apr. 10—Discount bills | 1,699,903,000 |
| Apr. 15—3½% ctfs. of ind | 356,835,000 |
| Apr. 15—Discount bills | 606,953,000 |
| Apr. 17—Discount bills | 1,700,648,000 |
| Apr. 24—Discount bills | 1,701,606,000 |
| May 1—Discount bills | 1,700,563,000 |
| May 8—Discount bills | 1,699,718,000 |
| May 15—Discount bills | 1,709,489,000 |
| May 22—Discount bills | 1,800,701,000 |
| May 29—Discount bills | 1,802,235,000 |
| June 5—Discount bills | 1,800,197,000 |
| June 12—Discount bills | 1,700,377,000 |
| June 15—2¾% Treas. bonds | 918,780,600 |
| June 15—2½% Treas. notes | 4,391,791,000 |
| June 15—2⅜% Treas. bonds | 4,244,811,000 |
| June 19—Discount bonds | 1,700,318,000 |
| Aug. 1—4% ctfs. of ind | 11,519,077,000 |
| Oct. 1—1½% Treas. notes | 121,269,000 |
| Dec. 1—3¾% ctfs. of ind | 9,832,719,000 |
| Dec. 15—2½% Treas. bonds | 2,368,365,500 |
| *1959* | |
| Jan. 1—Ser. E sav. bonds | 2,263,890,755 |
| Jan. 1—Ser. F sav. bonds | 201,981,303 |
| Jan. 1—Ser. G sav. bonds | 1,272,396,000 |
| Feb. 14—2½% ctfs. of ind | 9,766,725,000 |
| Feb. 15—1⅞% Treas. bonds | 5,102,277,000 |
| Total | 82,206,530,641 |
| Week ago | 82,206,327,641 |
| Year ago | 72,857,158,202 |

[1] Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is the significant figure. A week ago, the maturities, according to the New York Times, amounted to $82,206,327,641. That was less than the amount published today. A year ago the maturities amounted to $72,857,156,202. In other words, the maturities a year ago were almost $10 billion less than they are now.

In order that the meaning of this surprising statistical picture might be clear, I have had a computation made as to the percentage this represents of the national debt.

For the year 1952, before this administration took office, the national debt was $266 billion. The maturities which were due within 1 year, according to the New York Times, amounted to $55,700,000,000, or 20.8 percent of the national debt.

As of March 1958, the national debt had risen to $275,500,000,000. The maturities within the 12-month period amounted to $82.2 billion, or consisted of 29.8 percent of the national debt. Thus, the national debt has risen more than $9 billion, and the amount of the maturities which must be met within the 12-month period has increased 50 percent.

This administration has made the poorest fiscal record of any of the administrations having power and responsibility during the great crises which our Nation has encountered. The severity of crises has not been improved, it is worse than it was before.

What the Senator from Minnesota has said about the responsibility of the Government to take remedial steps immediately cannot be overemphasized. The Senator is quite correct. We may not all agree upon the things that ought to be done.

For myself, I believe that we must change the manner in which foreign aid is administered. I do not believe in military aid, now that we have reached the era of nuclear weapons. I do not believe in having Uncle Sam spend borrowed money to build outmoded weapons for use by European or Asiatic nations. I doubt the advisability of asking our friends in the rest of the world to allow their territories to become the sight of nuclear weapons launching stations.

But whatever may be the doubt of it, I have no doubt that if economic aid is provided, it will be administered in a way which will make the nations that receive the aid responsible for the administering of the aid. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will agree with me on that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Minnesota, of course. That was a curious mistake to make, because when I get the floor, I may say to the Senator, I shall quote remarks by a distinguished former Representative and Senator from Minnesota concerning the stockyards and packers bill. I shall quote the words of "Blind Tom" Schall, in his dramatic appeal against the murder of the Federal Trade Commission for the benefit of the big packers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's statement will be of great interest, because the late beloved Senator, "Blind Tom" Schall, as he was called, was truly an advocate of the people's interest.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his statistical information, which is always to the point, and is always very illuminating and informative.

I now turn to another subject, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

## ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the 84th Congress I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 152, an attempted compromise proposal in the electoral college debate. That proposal owes much of its genesis to the imagination and hard work of Dr. Ralph M. Goldman, now professor of political science at Michigan State University.

Dr. Goldman has just written for the Midwest Journal of Political Science an article entitled "HUBERT HUMPHREY'S Senate Joint Resolution 152: A New Proposal for Electoral College Reform." I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Goldman's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Midwest Journal of Political Science, vol. II, No. 1, of February 1958]

HUBERT HUMPHREY'S SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 152: A NEW PROPOSAL FOR ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

(By Ralph M. Goldman, Michigan State University)

The Senate gave brief consideration to the electoral college during March 1956. The main departure from previous Congressional discussion of the issue was the high degree of interest in finding a compromise solution. Two such compromises were proposed. The Daniel-Thurmond-Mundt compromise would enable the States to make their own choice between two earlier plans; that is, votes

could be counted according to either the Daniel-Kefauver (formerly Lodge-Gossett) or the Mundt-Coudert plan. The Humphrey compromise, on the other hand, offered an entirely new approach which would assign two electoral votes to the victor in each State and divide the remaining 435 electoral votes nationally in proportion to the nationwide popular vote.

A great many Senators were familiar with and committed to either the Daniel-Kefauver or the Mundt-Coudert plans and gave the sponsors of the Daniel-Thurmond-Mundt proposal a 48 to 37 majority in the Senate vote, 9 votes short of the two-thirds of those voting required for constitutional amendments. The Humphrey compromise, put into the hopper only 3 weeks prior to the floor debate and unfamiliar to most of the legislators, was set aside by a voice vote. The two new compromises and several previous plans were sent back to committee.[1]

### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 152 AS A COMPROMISE

The Humphrey compromise now establishes a fourth approach to electoral college reform. The principles and political implications of the new proposal were brought to the attention of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in July 1955, by the present writer.[2] Senate Joint Resolution 152 received practically no press publicity.[3] It was brought to the attention of about 46 Members of the Senate by a special letter from Senator HUMPHREY, dated March 9, 1956. Because the Senator's name was previously associated with various other proposals for changes in the electoral system, there was some confusion among his colleagues as to the relation, if any, between Senate Joint Resolution 152 and the other HUMPHREY-supported plans.

HUMPHREY'S Senate Joint Resolution 152 eliminates the electoral college and the presidential electors as such, a point on which nearly all reform proposals agree. Senate Joint Resolution 152 is the same as the Daniel-Kefauver and Mundt-Coudert proposals in that it retains the total strength of both Houses of Congress, that is, 531 votes, as the numerical basis for determining the election of Presidents. The Humphrey plan assigns the two senatorial electoral votes to the candidate winning the plurality of popular votes in each State, as does the Mundt-Coudert plan. Unlike the other reform proposals, however, the Humphrey compromise enables the presidential electorate as a national body to influence directly the presidential choice. This would occur by dividing the remaining block of 435 votes according to the proportion of popular votes received by each candidate on a nationwide basis.

As illustrated in table 1, in 1956 Dwight Eisenhower carried 41 of the 48 States, which, under this plan, would have given him 82 votes at the rate of 2 per State carried; Adlai Stevenson would have received 14 senatorial electoral votes. Of the more than 60 millions of votes cast nationally in the presidential contest, some 35 millions went to Eisenhower and over 25 millions to Stevenson. Dividing 435 electoral votes in the same proportion as the national popular vote would, under this new plan, have given Eisenhower an additional 249.6 electoral votes and Stevenson 182.3 additional votes. The total electoral vote would have been: Eisenhower, 331.6; Stevenson, 196.3; other candidates, 3.0.

TABLE 1.—*State strength in Presidential electoral voting under proposed Humphrey system (S. J. Res. 152)*

| | 1956 | | 1952 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Democrat | Republican | Democrat | Republican |
| Alabama | 4.0 | 1.4 | 3.9 | 1.1 |
| Arizona | .8 | 3.2 | .8 | 3.1 |
| Arkansas | 3.5 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 1.3 |
| California | 17.0 | 23.3 | 15.5 | 22.5 |
| Colorado | 1.8 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 4.7 |
| Connecticut | 2.8 | 7.0 | 3.4 | 6.3 |
| Delaware | .5 | 2.6 | .6 | 2.6 |
| Florida | 3.4 | 6.5 | 3.1 | 5.8 |
| Georgia | 5.1 | 1.5 | 5.2 | 1.4 |
| Idaho | .7 | 3.1 | .7 | 3.3 |
| Illinois | 12.4 | 20.4 | 14.2 | 19.4 |
| Indiana | 5.5 | 10.3 | 5.7 | 10.0 |
| Iowa | 3.5 | 7.1 | 3.2 | 7.7 |
| Kansas | 2.0 | 6.0 | 1.9 | 6.4 |
| Kentucky | 3.3 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 3.5 |
| Louisiana | 1.7 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 2.2 |
| Maine | .7 | 3.7 | .8 | 3.6 |
| Maryland | 2.6 | 6.0 | 2.8 | 5.5 |
| Massachusetts | 6.6 | 11.7 | 7.7 | 11.1 |
| Michigan | 9.5 | 14.0 | 8.7 | 13.0 |
| Minnesota | 4.3 | 7.0 | 4.3 | 7.4 |
| Mississippi | 3.0 | .4 | 3.2 | .8 |
| Missouri | 8.4 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 8.8 |
| Montana | .8 | 3.0 | .8 | 3.1 |
| Nebraska | 1.4 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 5.0 |
| Nevada | .3 | 2.4 | .2 | 2.4 |
| New Hampshire | .6 | 3.2 | .8 | 3.2 |
| New Jersey | 6.0 | 13.3 | 7.2 | 11.7 |
| New Mexico | .7 | 3.0 | .8 | 2.9 |
| New York | 19.3 | 32.4 | 21.9 | 29.9 |
| North Carolina | 6.2 | 4.1 | 6.6 | 3.9 |
| North Dakota | .6 | 3.1 | .5 | 3.4 |
| Ohio | 10.1 | 17.8 | 11.3 | 16.8 |
| Oklahoma | 2.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 5.7 |
| Oregon | 2.3 | 4.8 | 1.9 | 5.0 |
| Pennsylvania | 13.9 | 20.1 | 15.2 | 19.1 |
| Rhode Island | 1.1 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 3.5 |
| South Carolina | 3.6 | .5 | 3.2 | 1.2 |
| South Dakota | .8 | 3.2 | .6 | 3.4 |
| Tennessee | 3.2 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 5.2 |
| Texas | 6.0 | 9.6 | 6.8 | 9.8 |
| Utah | .8 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.4 |
| Vermont | .3 | 2.7 | .3 | 2.8 |
| Virginia | 1.9 | 4.7 | 1.9 | 4.5 |
| Washington | 3.6 | 6.4 | 3.5 | 6.2 |
| West Virginia | 2.6 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 3.0 |
| Wisconsin | 4.1 | 8.7 | 4.4 | 8.9 |
| Wyoming | .3 | 2.5 | .3 | 2.6 |
| Other parties | 3.0 | | 2.1 | |
| S. J. Res. 152 outcome | 196.3 | 331.6 | 210.8 | 318.1 |
| Outcome present system | 73.0 | 457.0 | 89.0 | 442.0 |

The compromise character of the Humphrey method rests upon the manner in which it applies the various principles traditionally accepted as part of the American presidential election system. First, the Humphrey plan gives recognition to the Federal principle by allowing the 96 senatorial electoral votes (out of 531 total) to fall according to the respective statewide popular votes. The Lehman-Langer approach does not at all allow the Federal principle. The Mundt-Coudert plan handles the Federal factor in the same way as the Humphrey plan, that is, by placing 96 of the 531 electoral votes under the influence of State-by-State voting returns. The present system, like the Daniel-Kefauver proposal, magnifies the role of federalism by placing electoral votes entirely under State influences.

Secondly, the Humphrey plan claims to reconcile the disparities among the other three plans with respect to the application of the population principle. The Langer-Lehman proposal is the extreme statement of the direct election approach. Theoretically, a 1-vote majority in 60 million votes cast could elect a President. The Lehman-Langer supporters, pointing to the national character of the modern Presidency, declare that under this system neither Congressional Districts nor State boundaries should intervene between the citizens of the Nation and their highest national officer. Finally, say the Langer-Lehman advocates, a direct election system puts a premium on political participation; getting out the vote would reap immediate rewards and, conversely, denial of access to the ballot box would automatically have punitive consequences for guilty States, regions, or parties. The Daniel-Kefauver and the Mundt-Coudert plans, on the other hand, assume that presidential voters act primarily as citizens of States and Congressional Districts. Under the Daniel-Kefauver system, a majority of the 531 votes must be built up out of popular majorities in the States. Under Mundt-Coudert, the Congressional Districts are where popular majorities count most. Daniel-Kefauver also claims to provide a stimulus to minority party activity in one-party States by assuring such minorities some part of the State's electoral vote, of which it now receives none. The new Humphrey method comes close to incorporating the Langer-Lehman nationwide direct election principle into the 531-vote framework of the other electoral systems. HUMPHREY'S Senate Joint Resolution 152 also has a built-in stimulus to voting participation.

Finally, the separation of powers principle would be maintained by the Humphrey plan. An essential feature of the separation of powers is the election of public officers by different electorates. Under present conditions, for example, Congressional District voters elect members of the House of Representatives; State voters choose Senators and decide the State's vote in the electoral college. The Mundt-Coudert plan, on the other hand, makes Congressional and presidential constituencies coincident with each other, negating the separation principle. Langer-Lehman sharply accentuates separation by creating an entirely new mass constituency for the Presidency. The Humphrey plan, it is argued, creates a new presidential constituency without going to the extreme of the Langer-Lehman plan.

### SOME POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW PLAN

After mathematically translating past presidential election results from the present counting system to that of the Humphrey plan, supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 152 have demonstrated several of the political implications of the new reform. Setting aside the probability that a somewhat different national party pattern might have developed under the Humphrey system, the same Presidents would have been elected under the Humphrey method in 21 of the 22 presidential elections between 1872 and 1956; the exception, 1876. The Humphrey method, however, would have modified the exaggerated electoral college majorities. The winners would have received an average of 78 fewer votes between 1872 and 1956. The principal losers would have received an average of 55 additional electoral votes over the same period.

Table 1 shows what the voting outcomes would have been, by States, in the elections of 1952 and 1956 under Senate Joint Resolution 152. Because 435 of the electoral votes are divided between the parties on a national basis, strictly speaking the only "State" votes would have been the 2 votes going to the plurality winner in each State. The computations of table 1, however, reveal how many electoral votes would have been contributed to the national party totals by the vote in each State. For example, under Senate Joint Resolution 152, Stevenson in 1952 would have received 210.8 electoral votes consisting of 18 senatorial votes from 9 States and 192.8 of the 435 nationwide electoral votes. To the 18 senatorial votes Alabama would have contributed 2 votes; to the 192.8 Alabama would have contributed

[1] For the floor debate, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 4, pp. 4932, 5120, 5127, 5136–5139, 5146–5166, 5231–5254, 5263, 5323–5325, 5332–5337, 5351–5357, 5365–5373, 5426–5440, 5445–5446, 5497, 5529, 5533–5574, 5626–5674.

[2] Correspondence with Max M. Kampelman, then Senator HUMPHREY'S legislative counsel, dated July 14, and 25, 1955. See also, author's letter to editor, New York Times, August 6, 1955.

[3] An exception was passing mention in Arthur Krock's column in the New York Times, March 16, 1956.

1.9. Alabama in 1952 would have contributed 1.1 electoral votes to the Republican side. This would have given Alabama a total strength of 5 presidential electoral votes. Alabama's actual electoral college strength under the present system was 11 votes. Total State strength would vary from quadrennium to quadrennium depending upon Alabama's—and every other State's—contribution to the total national turnout and its contribution to the national party totals. Alabama's low level of voter participation would have cost the State 6 electoral votes under the proposed system. On the other hand, California's high voter participation under the Humphrey system in 1952 would have raised that State's electoral strength from the 32 votes it actually had to a new total of 38 votes.

Still another probable consequence of the Humphrey plan would be the strengthening of the national organs of the political parties under the necessity of waging campaigns with equal vigor in every State. Under the present system the major campaign efforts are made in the large pivotal States of New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and a few others. It now takes a plurality of but a few votes to win all of the New York's 45 electoral college votes, California's 43, etc. Under the Humphrey system most State party victories would consist of 2 or 3 electoral vote margins. In 1956, for example, the distribution of the national presidenial vote was such that dominant State parties would have received 2 to 2.9 more electoral votes than the principal minority parties in 28 of the 48 States; in only 6 instances would the electoral vote spread have been 6 votes or more (California, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania). Such a spreading of the rewards for success among so many States would heighten the need for coordinated and widely distributed presidential campaign effort on a national basis. As a consequence, the duties of the national party organs would undoubtedly be multiplied. The national parties would compete not primarily for the electoral votes of a few major States but for a plurality of the 435 electoral votes available nationwide and for the 2-vote electoral margins in as many individual States as possible.

The importance of States with 2-to-3 vote electoral margins would tend to eliminate the pivot State approach to presidential politics.[4] New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, etc., would continue to be focal States for campaign activity for reasons of sheer size of population as well as the prospect of higher than average voter participation characteristic of these States. These States, however, would have to share campaign attention with such States as Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Utah, and Wyoming.

The Humphrey plan—for that matter, any change in the present electoral college system—would undoubtedly cause repercussions in the politics of presidential nominations. For example, one obvious consequence would be an improvement in the nomination prospects of aspirants coming from States other than the large, pivotal ones. Secondly, since the main principles of apportionment of votes in the national conventions have traditionally followed the principles inherent in the electoral college system, it is possible that a change in the method of presidential election would be followed by a change in the apportionment of nominating strength.

The new Humphrey plan for reform of the electoral college system of electing the President adds a fourth to the existing three types of proposals in this field. Senate Joint Resolution 152, which embodies the Humphrey proposal, has been offered as a compromise among the existing plans, on grounds that it applies the reconcilable principles underlying each of the others in a practical manner. Supporters of the Humphrey plan also claim that the new system would bring the outdated method of choosing the President abreast of modern conditions of nationwide two-party competition and national presidential electorates.

[4] Defenders of the present electoral college system, particularly some leaders of minority groups in metropolitan centers, argue that their main source of influence in national politics rests upon the strategic location of the popular votes of their groups in the large, closely-contested States. Presumably the President who fails to support the aspirations of these influential minorities would run the risk of losing their critical votes in the key States such as New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, etc. This has been a cardinal political principle for minority group leaders in recent years, yet nowhere are its premises conclusively supported by the facts. While it is true that the electoral college votes of New York and the other pivotal States may be won or lost by a handful of popular votes, it is highly problematical that minority group leaders could deliver their supporters in substantial numbers from one party to the other in the short run. Although long run trends and changes are certainly occurring in minority groups voting for President, it does not seem likely that group leaders could in the short run dramatically change the Democratic preference of two-thirds to four-fifths of the voting Negroes, Catholics, Jews, Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, etc. The majority preference within many of these groups has been known to change over the long run—Negroes moved from the Republican to the Democratic Party during the New Deal years, Jews were heavily Republican in the earlier part of the century, Catholics seem to be shifting from the Democratic Party during the past 2 or 3 presidential elections, etc.—but not overwhelmingly in the short run. For sources of these observations see Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller, The Voter Decides (Evanston: Clawes, 1954); Bernard R. Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, William N. McPhee, Voting (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954); V. O. Key, Jr., Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups (3d ed., New York: Crowell, 1952); Lawrence Fuchs, American Jews and the Presidential Vote, American Political Science Review XLIX (June 1955), 385–401.

Under the proposed Humphrey system, organized minorities would have to develop nationwide in place of local manifestations of strength. This would probably be consistent with existing trends away from a parochial minority group policitics as successive generations of descendants of immigrants become integrated into the American community, as some minorities depart from ghettoes to suburbia, and as the South becomes less solid and more like the rest of the Nation in its political patterns. In the very nature of the pluralism of American politics, organized minorities may be expected to exert substantial influence under any system of presidential election. To equate the survival of minority group influence with the preservation of a dubious strategic advantage under the present electoral college system is to place that influence upon very tenuous grounds indeed.

## ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion for the reconsideration of the vote by which the Senate passed Senate bill 1538, to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes. This bill was Calendar No. 1301.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the House of Representatives be requested to return Senate bill 1538 to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## REGULATION OF COMMERCE IN MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, today the Senate entered into an unanimous-consent agreement whereby the so-called packers and stockyard bill—which is Calendar No. 706, Senate bill 1356, a bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes, which was reported to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary—was referred to the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with instructions to report it back to the Senate Calendar not later than April 21, with their recommendations.

At the time when that agreement was entered into I announced, as the Senator in charge of the bill, that I was willing to agree to that method of handling the matter, not because I had any fears about the willingness of the Senate to pass the bill, but because I felt that it was only fair that the Members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have an opportunity to study the reasons why the bill is a "must" if we believe in economic freedom and the preservation of what we call free enterprise.

### CONCERNED WITH PROBLEM SINCE 1916

Mr. President, it has been my good fortune to have been associated with this problem from the time when I first came to the Senate as the secretary of Senator John B. Kendrick, of Wyoming. Senator Kendrick, when governor of Wyoming, was elected to the United States Senate in 1916. He invited me to come to Washington as his secretary. I did so. After coming to Washington, I attended the night sessions of Georgetown University Law School, from which I was graduated in 3 years. Then I resigned as secretary, to enter the practice of law. In 1922, I managed Senator Kendrick's campaign for reelection to the Senate.

During those experiences—first, as his secretary; then as a lawyer watching the proceedings in the Senate and those in the State of Wyoming; and, later, as manager of Senator Kendrick's political campaigns—I came to understand his feelings toward the meat industry.

Senator Kendrick was one of the largest cattlemen in the West. At one time

he was president of the American National Livestock Association. When he came to Washington, he was determined to play his part, insofar as he could, in breaking what he considered to be the monopolistic hold which the 5 big meat packers had at that time on the meat industry.

The President of the United States had instructed the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of the conditions which existed at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is making a contribution to the subject matter of the proposed amendment of the Stockyards Act, and I believe it merits the attention of more Senators. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may yield to me, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, but without causing the Senator from Wyoming to lose his right to the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With that understanding, Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. I am advised that many of the committees of the Senate are in session this afternoon on important hearings, and I do not wish to disturb those hearings by calling for a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FTC MADE INVESTIGATION OF PACKERS 40 YEARS AGO

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the quorum call I was referring to the fact that the then President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, had requested the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of the monopolistic practices of the packers. One of the outstanding lawyers of the period, Mr. Francis J. Heney, of California, was placed in charge of that investigation. He was a remarkable man, a bulldog of a lawyer, a man with a capacity to seek and obtain evidence. He brought in such a report for the Federal Trade Commission that the Department of Justice had no difficulty in securing a consent decree from the big packers.

THESE TRADE PRACTICES WERE REPORTED

I want the RECORD of the Senate today to show some of the practices which were found by Mr. Heney to have been indulged in by the packers. There were five of them, including Armour, Swift, Morris, and Sulzberger. He found, for example, that the large companies had continued, during the war years when the Nation was fighting for the life of freedom, to engage in a livestock pool under which the purchases of livestock sent to market were made according to definite percentages agreed upon for for long periods. That is No. 1.

No. 2, it found evidence of a combination between Armour, Swift, Morris, and Sulzberger with British and South American companies to regulate and divide beef and mutton importations from Argentina and Uruguay into the United States and from South America into European ports.

They were not content to restrain themselves to monopolistic practices affecting the growers and consumers in the United States, but they sought to control and regulate commerce of foreign nations as well.

No. 3. The Commission found evidence of an agreement whereby the companies limited the amount of dressed meat which packers would have for sale in proportion approximately to the percentage of live animals upon the ground.

No. 4. It found proof of hoarding of cheese during the war by a combination of packers which, through their control of large cheese firms, controlled the cheese market.

No. 5. In addition, the Federal Trade Commission found that the large meatpacking companies exercised great market power over many food items which were not related to meat. These companies were distributing, through their organizations, such varied items as vegetables, fish, fruits, condiments, rice, cereals, and many others.

Finally, it was found that the large meatpacking companies had gained control of some 50 stockyards in the United States, which themselves controlled about 69 percent of the business. The 4 largest yards received more than 53 percent of the cattle, 43 percent of the hogs, and 53 percent of the sheep.

The Big Five, it was shown, either jointly or separately, had an interest in 28 of the 50 yards, controlled the majority of the voting stock in 22 of them, and were jointly interested in 15 of them. Approximately 84 percent of the animals marketed passed through the yards controlled by the big five at such points as Chicago, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Omaha, which had great and decisive influence on other markets which were controlled by the large companies.

DEFENDANTS WERE GLAD TO ACCEPT CONSENT DECREE

The facts were such, as I have already pointed out, that the Department of Justice, having brought an antitrust suit, had no difficulty in persuading the defendants to accept a consent decree. The Department took the consent decree because it was easier to obtain a decree in that manner than to fight the giant combine through all the levels of the courts of the land. On the theory that a half a loaf was better than no bread, the consent decree was accepted. But it took years to draw the final order, which was intended to break down the monopoly.

PACKERS DICTATED PRICES AT PRODUCER AND RETAIL LEVELS

The 5 big packers, as is proven by the figures I have recited, which figures can be verified by the record, were in a position that enabled them to tell the grower of livestock—to tell the farmer who raised hogs, to tell the rancher who raised cattle, to tell the farmer and rancher who raised sheep—the prices they would have to take for their animals. At the same time, because they were in control of the distributing facilities, they were able to tell the housewife, the hotel keeper, and every consumer the prices which had to be paid for the finished product. They were able to control prices of nonfood items, such as tennis rackets and other commodities which were made from those parts of the live animal which were not usable for food.

The consent decree was not sufficient.

KENDRICK INTRODUCED BILL TO STOP MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES

My former chief and great friend, John B. Kendrick, one of the most respected men who ever sat in the Senate Chamber, made up his mind that he would make every effort to seek by legislation to close the door firmly and finally upon these monopolistic practices, so he introduced what became known as the Kendrick-Kenyon bill.

It perhaps is worth mentioning that just as the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and I are joint sponsors of the bill under consideration, one of us a Democrat and the other a Republican, so also were Senator Kendrick and Senator Kenyon of opposite political faiths. Senator Kendrick was a Democrat, and Senator William S. Kenyon of Iowa was one of the great men the State of Iowa sent to the Senate in years past. They were both convinced that if the freedom of opportunity and competition was to be maintained in the United States the Federal Trade Commission, which had done such a superlative job in bringing the packers to give consent to an antitrust decree, should be given the power to enforce the antitrust laws.

FTC LOGICAL AGENCY TO ENFORCE ANTI-MONOPOLY LAW

What could be more logical? What could be more simple than that the act passed by Congress in 1914 to prohibit monopolistic practices and unfair trade practices in commerce should be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission, and not by the Department of Agriculture?

REPRESENTATIVE TOM SCHALL CRIED "MURDER"

I desire to read into the RECORD today an eloquent statement by blind Tom Schall, who was at that time a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota. He afterwards was elected to the Senate.

Many a day I have heard Senator Schall stand to speak from his side of the aisle, in the second row from the front, speaking, of course, without assistance. He had no aide or clerk to suggest to him what to say. He had no document from which he could read. But with a perfectly clear mind, in eloquent language, he would tell the story which his studies had revealed about whatever subject he was discussing. He was admired and loved by his associates both in the Senate and in the House.

The speech to which I refer was delivered on August 9, 1921. I shall read from page 4784 of volume 61, part 5 of

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 67th Congress, 1st session:

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, the stage is set. The scene is laid. The curtain has risen. The first act is about to come off. Many of the Congressmen are home. What is to be done? A little job of murder. Who is to be killed? The Federal Trade Commission. Why? Because they have done their duty honestly and faithfully. Sentence has been passed. It has been O. K.'d by the Senate, and it is back here to be O. K.'d by the House. No chance to amend it. Our only hope is in the future. In order to be sure that the bill passed it is plastered around with regulations that should go into effect, that should have gone into effect long ago, but that would never have been brought to light had it not been for the courage and industry and integrity of the investigations of this very Federal Trade Commission which certain clauses of this bill now seek to quietly assassinate. Every good provision in the bill has been inspired by the work of the Federal Trade Commission, yet buried deep in this law is the death sentence of that commission, the only legal machinery which has been constructed that has proven itself equipped to meet the industrial problems of today in the interest of the public.

This is the first act of a long and ill-conceived tragedy. Next will come the clause in the futures trading bill which will attempt to take from the Federal Trade Commission their jurisdiction over the grain trade. Then the clause in the misbranding bill taking their power away over misbranding.

PACKER LOBBYISTS COMMITTED THE MURDER

And so he continued. The first act in the great tragedy of destroying the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission was about to take place. It did take place, exactly as he predicted. The clauses which gave the Federal Trade Commission the authority to enforce its own act were eliminated from the bill by special amendments that were written in the handwriting of one of the lobbyists for the packers. They were amendments which transferred the enforcement of the antitrust Federal Trade Commission Act from the Federal Trade Commission to the Department of Agriculture, upon the alleged argument that it was an agricultural problem. It was not an agricultural problem; it was a problem of trade and commerce in the purchase and sale of material.

As I have already pointed out in my previous address upon this subject, the packers represented themselves as being the friends of the stockmen and of the consumer. So, because of the argument that they were friends who would serve the best interests of the producer and the consumer, the Federal Trade Commission was murdered, as blind Tom Schall said it would be, so far as this act was concerned. The Federal Trade Commission lost its jurisdiction.

ADMISSION THAT AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO ENFORCE LAW

In the hearings over which I presided last year as Acting Chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Assistant Secretary Earl Butz, of the Department of Agriculture, testified, in response to an inquiry by my colleague, the Senator from Utah (Mr. WATKINS), that for 26 years the Department of Agriculture had inadequately enforced the antitrust law.

We listened with applause to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the elimination of overlapping jurisdictions. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], a great advocate of economy, has come on this floor time and time again to point out how money is wasted by the Federal Government through the duplication of efforts. Here we have a Federal Trade Commission staff knowledgeable in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and a Department of Agriculture which is not so staffed. Is it any wonder that the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture had to confess, under interrogation, that the Department of Agriculture was not adequately enforcing the law?

CONSENT DECREE OF 1920

I referred to the action of the Department of Justice. I think it proper that there should be placed in the RECORD at this point a description of the consent decree.

After a long series of negotiations with representatives of the five largest packing companies, this prearranged settlement took place. On February 27, 1920, a petition alleging an unlawful combination was filed in the District of Columbia courts, and simultaneously a consent decree, already signed, was entered in the court's records. These companies, which were Swift, Armour, Morris, Wilson, and Cudahy, were restrained by this consent decree of 1920 from the following acts:

First. Doing any act amounting to a combination in restraint of trade;

Second. Engaging in any unlawful trade practice;

Third. Engaging in the public storage warehouse business;

Fourth. Engaging in the public stockyards business;

Fifth. Engaging in any line of retail business, both in the meat line and every other line; and

Sixth. Engaging in the so-called unrelated lines of food, which were defined and enumerated, particularly in all the lines of wholesale groceries.

PRESENT ATTEMPT TO CHANGE DECREE TERMS

Three of these major packing companies recently initiated an attempt to have the terms of this 1920 consent decree changed, particularly to allow them to handle unrelated lines of groceries.

That petition to revise the consent decree of 1920 was filed here in the district court, and the packers who were asking to be relieved from the decree prohibiting them from engaging in certain antitrust practices sought to have the action transferred to the Federal courts in Chicago. Such an order was entered. The matter is still pending there.

The Department of Justice has not agreed to the modification of the consent decree, and I know of no rumors or reports to the effect that any consent is now being considered. But I have no hesitation in suggesting that if the Congress of the United States should now say that we may have special legislation for the benefit of the packing industry so that it may be relieved from the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, it will not be long before other segments of industry will find a way to escape the prohibitions of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

MONOPOLY ESTABLISHES PRIVATE REGULATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. The issue in the world today, which is about to be decided by the result of the cold economic war, is the issue as to whether we are to have totalitarianism in politics and business, or whether we are to have free government in politics and business.

When a small group of corporations becomes so powerful that it can take control of any line of business and bring under control other unrelated lines, it is inevitably closing the door of opportunity to many others.

Mergers, combinations in restraint of trade, and concentrations of economic power—all are the familiar aspects of monopoly; and monopoly is the establishment of private regulation of commerce.

RIGHT TO REGULATE COMMERCE IS VESTED IN CONGRESS

When the great men who wrote the Constitution of the United States sat at the Constitutional Convention they had no idea of turning control of commerce over to monopoly. Quite the contrary. They wrote into the Constitution, in article I, section 8, the careful provision that the Congress should have the right to regulate commerce among the States, with foreign nations, and with the Indian tribes. There is the power and the duty of Congress. There is no other power in America which has the right to regulate business.

GOVERNMENT HAS NO POWER TO CONTROL BUSINESS

There is no power, not even within the Government itself, to control business. I have seen Members of the Senate and Members of the House on numerous occasions in the past—men who proclaim themselves as opponents of socialism—introduce bills, the effect of which was to put the Government itself in business and to give the Government power to control.

The theory of our Government is that it is made for the people—all of the people—and every great President whom we have ever had, and every great leader from Washington down through Jefferson and Daniel Webster and Abraham Lincoln, has not hesitated to say that ours is a Government of living persons who constitute America.

CORPORATIONS ARE CREATIONS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, a few days ago there came to my hands a little pamphlet, containing an article written by Mr. Robert C. Tyson, chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corp. I do not think Mr. Tyson ever expected me to quote anything that he said. However, he wrote a paragraph which I think is well worthy of quotation. He wrote a special sentence which every newspaper in America and every radio and television channel in America and every member of the Government in America should remember and should repeat. The United States Steel Corp., like the National Steel Corp., when it

appeared before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is a distinguished member, refused every suggestion made by any member of the subcommittee that the price of steel be reduced. They knew that steel was a commodity needed in almost everything that goes into the building of a great America. They knew, when they refused, that the Government was engaged in the great program of building for defense, using steel, but they were not interested in the price the Government had to pay.

As I pointed out earlier today, with the interest on the national debt running at $7,900,000,000, with the cost of rehabilitating and paying the pensions of the veterans running at the rate of $5 billion a year, and with the mutual security appropriations running at the rate of $43.9 billion, we are spending $58.7 billion for past wars and future wars and economic crises. We are borrowing money to give to the steel companies and the automobile companies on the contracts they are about to receive because there is unemployment in the automobile industry.

Against this background, Mr. Tyson, in speaking about taxation and the terrible plight of the big corporations, says:

> Well, let's take a look at corporate taxation and double taxation. Corporations are the creations of government.

I ask Senators to listen to that sentence:

> Corporations are the creations of government. They are the resourceful invention of people to enable large numbers of them cooperatively to pool their resources and their labor and so accomplish mighty production tasks beyond the power of any one individual or small numbers of them. The dividends paid by these corporations are less than 4 percent of the Nation's income, yet corporations provide nearly three-fourths of all the nongovernmental wages and salaries paid. The corporate economy is also the biggest remaining segment of business life that is still disciplined by vigorous competition.

I wonder through what kind of glasses he was looking when he wrote the word "competition."

> In the light of all this there must surely be something wrong with a generalized attitude of hostility toward corporations and their profits as such.

I stop reading long enough to say that I have no hostility toward corporations or their earnings, but I do know that corporations consist of a great segment of our economy. They perform activities which individuals would be incompetent to perform in their own right or ability. What I am emphasizing here is what Mr. Tyson said, that corporations are the creations of government. In other words, a corporation cannot exist unless some government gives it a charter.

### STATES CREATE CORPORATIONS THEY CANNOT REGULATE

Here is a situation that constitutes a terrible anomaly in the United States, which poses as the leader of the Free World. The Constitution gave to Congress the right—nay, the duty—to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations, and took that right from the States. The Thirteen Original Colonies, before the Union was formed, could regulate corporate activities within their boundaries and could regulate commerce, but after the Nation was set up, interstate and foreign commerce became the sole jurisdiction of the National Government while the States lost the power to regulate commerce, they were allowed to retain the power of creating corporations, which are the instruments of the interstate and foreign commerce that the corporations carry on.

How absurd that the State of New Jersey, the State of Delaware, the State of Wyoming, and any other State anyone may care to name should have the power to authorize a group of individuals to create a corporation which then, without let or say from the Government of the United States, which has the constitutional power to go into foreign commerce, should have the right to go into it as they please. They write their own tickets. Any Member of the Senate who is a lawyer, or as a Member has had an opportunity to read charters issued by some of the States which are patronized by the big corporations knows full well that the charters take no concern whatsoever to protect the rights of the individual. They take no concern whatever to protect individual rights, producer rights, or consumer rights. They are blank checks by which the promoters of corporate organizations may do whatever they please. Here we have an illustration of what is now going on.

### CHAINSTORES POSE AS PACKERS

Last Friday I referred to the fact that the amendments which were written into the bill were intended to protect the packers.

I must secure the document I had, in which these various matters were related. Sufficient it will be, I am sure, for me to summarize the facts. Into the Packers and Stockyards Act were written the amendments in which Representative Schall, as he was then, pointed out that the power of the Federal Trade Commission to have jurisdiction over its own act was eliminated. It was written into the Packers and Stockyards Act that that jurisdiction should not apply to the packers.

Now what has happened? I have here a letter dated March 19, 1958, from the Office of the General Counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, which was written at my request. It reads:

> FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
> OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
> *Washington, March 19, 1958.*
>
> Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In response to your request of March 18, 1958, the best information we have indicates that National Tea Co. is a packer subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act. This is based upon a list of packers issued by the Secretary of Agriculture on June 17, 1957. The following eight major chainstore organizations appear on that list: American Stores Co.; First National Stores; Food Fair Stores; Giant Food Shopping Center; the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.; the Kroger Co.; National Tea Co.; Safeway Stores, Inc.
>
> The approximate 1956 sales, areas of operation, and number of units of these organizations (with the exception of Giant Food Shopping Center) are indicated on an attached list. This list indicates sales and unit data of the 15 major food chains. As you will note, the seven largest chain-store organizations on this list are classified as packers.
>
> To this point the status of any of such eight major chain organizations as a packer has been fully litigated before the Commission in only one case. Food Fair Stores, Inc. The decision in that case was, as you know, that Food Fair, by reason of its ownership of a packing establishment, qualified as a packer and was not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. In another case, Giant Food Shopping Center, the Commission has ruled that it has jurisdiction but this ruling is subject to appeal to the courts.
>
> Among other concerns listed as packers on the Agriculture list of June 17 are the following: Procter & Gamble, Heublein, Inc., Continental Baking Co., Beech-Nut Life Savers, Campbell Soup Co., Carnation Co., Crosse & Blackwell, Durkee Famous Food, H. J. Heinz Co., Libby-McNeil-Libby, The Quaker Oats Co., Seabrook Farms Co., Hot Shoppes, Howard Johnson's, Stouffer Corporation, Birds Eye Division, General Foods Corp., College Inn Food Products Co., Duffy-Mott Co., Gerber Products Co., La Choy Food Products, Division of Beatrice Foods, Stokely-Van Camp.
>
> Of the above, to this point only Procter & Gamble and Crosse & Blackwell have been made the subject of litigation as to packer status. The Commission ruled that Crosse & Blackwell is not a packer. On September 30, 1957, the Commission issued a complaint against Procter & Gamble charging it with violation of the Antimerger Act, Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, by reason of its acquisition of the Clorox Chemical Co. Subsequently, Procter & Gamble sought dismissal of the complaint on the basis that it was a packer. The Commission's hearing examiner denied this motion. But Procter & Gamble, though not appealing the hearing examiner's decision, specifically reserved the right to argue this point subsequently before the Commission.
>
> In seven cases the Commission's Bureau of Litigation has returned to the Bureau of Investigation files containing a recommendation for complaint, for further investigation to determine whether the Commission has jurisdiction under the Packers and Stockyards Act. Several of these cases involve some of the Nation's largest chain-store organizations.
>
> At the present time in the Bureau of Investigation there are pending a total of 31 matters involving concerns which are listed with the Secretary of Agriculture as meat-packers. Because of the jurisdictional questions which have arisen and because the facts developed in such cases do not disclose in detail the exact status of the proposed respondents, supplemental investigation of these 31 matters has been or may be undertaken for the purpose of securing information on their packing status.
>
> Our letters of June 28, 1956 and May 28, 1957, to you have summarized matters referred to the Secretary of Agriculture from January 1, 1950 to May 3, 1957. Our correspondence files indicate that three additional matters have been referred since May 8, 1957, and these are on the attached list. There have been, however, an undetermined number of additional instances in which the Commission has advised complainants of its lack of jurisdiction and has suggested that the parties communicate with the Department of Agriculture.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> EARL W. KINTNER,
> *General Counsel.*

COMPLAINTS ABOUT PACKERS REFERRED TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Accompanying the letter was a table entitled, "Summary Information on Complaints Involving the Practices of Packers Which Were Referred to the Department of Agriculture—May 6, 1957, to March 7, 1958." I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Summary information on complaints involving the practices of packers which were referred to the Department of Agriculture, May 6, 1957–Mar. 7, 1958*

| Correspondence No. | Packer | Date | Nature of complaint and disposition |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8714 | Grand Duchess Steaks, Inc. | Nov. 5, 1957 | Allegation that hamburger is misbranded as "steak." Complaint transmitted to Department of Agriculture. |
| 8947 | Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. | Dec. 4, 1957 | Allegation that ribs are removed from rib steaks and the product passed off as T-bone steak. Complaint transmitted to Department of Agriculture. |
| 9667 | Stock Yard Inn | Feb. 21, 1958 | Allegation that advertisement offered mail-order steaks postage prepaid, and consignee was later billed for transportation charges. Complaint transmitted to Department of Agriculture. |

DATA ON SALES OF CHAINS POSING AS PACKERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a partial list of the sales and unit data on the 15 major food chains, mentioned by Mr. Kintner in his letter.

The source of this information is Moody's Industrials for 1957. There is, of course, no question about the accuracy of the report.

We find National Tea Co. listed as having been registered voluntarily, by itself, with the Department of Agriculture as a packer. The meaning of this registration is that National Tea Co., which engages in the sale of many commodities besides meat products—and to what extent it engages in the sale of meat products, I am not prepared to say at this moment—is released from the prohibitions against unfair and monopolistic trade practices.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Sales and unit data (partially preliminary) on the 15 major food chains*

| Name | 1956 sales | Areas | Units |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. & P.[1] | $4,304,990,650 | 40 States and District of Columbia, 2 provinces of Canada. | 4,650 |
| Safeway [1] | 1,989,305,295 | 24 States, District of Columbia, and Canada. | 1,981 |
| Kroger [1] | 1,492,552,000 | 21 States | 1,476 |
| American [1] | 654,727,474 | 7 States and District of Columbia | 953 |
| National Tea [1] | 617,635,555 | 12 States | 761 |
| First National [1] | 491,667,908 | 7 States | 661 |
| Food Fair [1] | 475,197,534 | do | 238 |
| Colonial | 423,040,272 | 11 States | 449 |
| Winn-Dixie | 421,327,312 | 9 States | 447 |
| Jewel Tea [2] | 334,755,447 | 1 State | 184 |
| ACF Wrigley | 138,351,493 | 4 States | 154 |
| Grand Union | 374,155,488 | 9 States, District of Columbia, and Canada. | 354 |
| Loblaw | 241,495,440 | 1 State (New York) | 182 |
| Bohack | 141,768,102 | do | 184 |
| Penn Fruit | 134,140,169 | 3 States | 45 |
| Total | 12,235,110,139 | | 12,719 |
| Total 1956 retail sales of food | [3]43,040,000,000 | | |

[1] Indicates packers.
[2] Routes 2,000 in 42 States and District of Columbia.
[3] MARGUS.

Source: Moody's Industrials, 1957.

AMERICAN "PACKER" IS OWNED BY FOREIGN CORPORATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is a little mistake about National Tea Co. It is listed here as one of the 15 largest food chains. But National Tea Co. is no longer an independent corporation. National Tea Co. became the property of George Weston, Ltd., about Thanksgiving 1955. There was a payment of, I think, some $25 million to accomplish that sale. Barron's Weekly, for St. Patrick's Day, this year, published an article, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, although I shall read a part of it now. The title is:

George Weston, Ltd. It has carved out a vast empire in the food business.

I wish to make it clear, before I read from the article, that what I am talking about is the manner in which a foreign corporation, created by a government other than ours, can evade the antitrust laws of the United States. George Weston, Ltd., is not an American company.

Mr. President, there is not a family in the United States which is not interested in the price of food. The departments of the Government tell us every day and every month that the cost of living is rising and that the price of food is rising. It was so stated today in the March issue of Economic Indicators.

George Weston, Ltd., is a vast empire in the food business.

The article reads in part as follows:

When business lags, corporate horizons narrow. In slack periods like the present, most companies prefer to sit tight and wait for a turn in the economy. Thus a growing number of expansion programs of late have been trimmed severely or shelved. Yet in the past hard times have brought some companies opportunities for vigorous growth. Notable among these is George Weston, Ltd., of Toronto. By buying up impoverished firms in the early thirties, it grew from a successful but small biscuit baker into a major one. Moreover, in the process it entered the United States market, thus laying the foundation for today's mighty food empire, which spans the length and breadth of North America.

Mr. President, when I read the foregoing from Barron's Weekly, certainly no one can charge me with indulging in extravagant language of the left. Instead, I am reading the language of the right; I am reading the language used by the conservative Wall Street publication, Barron's Weekly, which refers to George Weston, Ltd., as having laid "the foundation for today's mighty food empire, which spans the length and breadth of North America."

I read further from the article:

BUSINESS SCOPE WIDENED

It was the momentum gathered during the great depression, as much as anything, that enabled Weston to cash in so handsomely on the postwar boom. In the decade following the end of World War II, its profits more than tripled. Furthermore, the scope of the business was broadened greatly. Through acquisition of controlling interests in Loblaw Groceterias, a leading Canadian grocery chain, and National Tea, an equally fast-growing United States counterpart, Weston carved out an impressive niche in the burgeoning supermarket field. As a result, Weston now occupies a unique position in the food industry. On the one hand, it is an important manufacturer and distributor of biscuits, bread, cakes, and other food products; on the other, as retailer, it controls a vast Canadian and United States network of over 1,000 supermarkets.

Mr. President, I shall not take more of the time of the Senate this afternoon to read from the article. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article, together with the accompanying table, as they appear on pages 15 to 18 of Barron's Weekly of March 17, 1958, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE WESTON, LTD.: IT HAS CARVED OUT A VAST EMPIRE IN THE FOOD BUSINESS

When business lags, corporate horizons narrow. In slack periods like the present, most companies prefer to sit tight and wait for a turn in the economy. Thus a growing number of expansion programs of late have been trimmed severely or shelved. Yet in the past hard times have brought some companies opportunities for vigorous growth. Notable among these is George Weston, Ltd., of Toronto. By buying up impoverished firms in the early thirties, it grew from a successful but small biscuit baker into a major one. Moreover, in the process it entered the United States market, thus laying the foundation for today's mighty food empire, which spans the length and breadth of North America.

BUSINESS SCOPE WIDENED

It was the momentum gathered during the great depression, as much as anything, that enabled Weston to cash in so handsomely on the postwar boom. In the decade following the end of World War II, its profits more than tripled. Furthermore, the scope of the business was broadened greatly. Through

acquisition of controlling interests in Loblaw Groceterias, a leading Canadian grocery chain, and National Tea, an equally fast-growing United States counterpart, Weston carved out an impressive niche in the burgeoning supermarket field. As a result, Weston now occupies a unique position in the food industry. On the one hand, it is an important manufacturer and distributor of biscuits, bread, cakes, and other food products; on the other, as retailer, it controls a vast Canadian and United States network of over 1,000 supermarkets.

The instrument through which it exercises control over its food chain Goliaths is a 51-percent-owned holding company, Loblaw Cos. The latter holds 97 percent of the common and second preferred shares of Loblaw Groceterias, which operates 188 stores in Ontario. In turn, Loblaw Groceterias holds 55 percent of the stock of Loblaw's, Inc. The latter chain numbers 121 units in New York State, 37 in Pennsylvania, 22 in Ohio, and 1 in West Virginia. Loblaw Groceterias also owns about 30 percent of the common of National Tea, which has 883 outlets, concentrated principally in the Midwest. Recently, George C. Metcalf, the empire's chief executive (president of Weston and Loblaw companies and chairman of Loblaw Groceterias and National Tea), confirmed that eventually Loblaw's, Inc., and National Tea would be merged. The possibility also exists of an ultimate further amalgam, including Loblaw Groceterias.

Except to the extent of dividends received, the interest in the Loblaw group is not consolidated in the parent company's balance sheet. A truer measure of Weston's earning power is obtained by including the company's interest in the net of its nonconsolidated subsidiaries. On such a pro forma basis, Weston earned $3.10 per share in 1957, a brisk 12.8 percent gain over 1956's $2.73. In view of the continuing stress on expansion—the 3 grocery chains under its control will open a combined total of 200 supermarkets this year alone—and the resourceful merchandising which characterizes every segment of its widespread operations, further progress appears likely in 1958.

On the manufacturing end, Weston turns out a host of food products on both sides of the border. In biscuits, it ranks first in Canada and, through Weston Biscuit Co., a wholly owned subsidiary, fourth in this country. In the Dominion, in addition to the parent company, which has biscuit facilities in Toronto, Longueuil (Montreal), and Edmonton, and a confectionery plant at Brantford, Ontario, the roster of operating companies includes Marven's, Ltd., which produces biscuits and potato chips for the Maritimes and Quebec markets; McCormick's, in London, Ontario, which turns out biscuits, candy, ice cream cones, and sipping straws; Paulin-Chambers, which makes biscuits and candy in Winnipeg; and the Independent Biscuit Co. of Calgary, Alberta.

Each member of this coast-to-coast Canadian biscuit and candy network operates on a highly decentralized basis. In fact, they compete with one another on the shelves of Loblaw Groceterias. In addition, each subsidiary handles its own purchases of essential ingredients, and draws up and directs its own advertising program. Supplementing their activities is Weston Bakers, Ltd., which operates cake and bread bakeries in most of the Dominion's leading cities. Another subsidiary, Western Grocers, Ltd., runs a string of cold storage plants and warehouses, from the Great Lakes to Vancouver. Western Grocers also carries on a large wholesale food and vegetable business and a wholesale grocery operation in British Columbia. It is affiliated closely with Red and White Stores. Although independently owned, Red and White's 1,000 outlets are associated with Western Grocers under a merchandising agreement.

The Weston empire encompasses still more. The William Neilson subsidiary in Toronto manufactures and distributes cocoa, boxed chocolates, candy bars, and ice cream. Doctor Jackson Foods, Ltd., produces uncooked cereals at facilities in Toronto and Longueuil. Willard's Chocolate Co. also is Toronto based. Somerville, Ltd., operates seven converting plants specializing in offset lithography and printing of folding cartons for packaging food, candy, drugs, and tobacco products. Besides providing most of the wrapping materials for the Weston subsidiaries, Somerville is a large supplier to the automotive industry of cardboard-type panels for the inside of car and truck doors.

In all, the organization's food sales run to $2 billion a year. The parent company does not disclose the respective contributions to earnings of the various segments of its operation. Nevertheless, it is believed that, excluding dividends from Loblaw companies, between 30 percent and 40 percent of profits are derived from the United States subsidiary; 25 percent from Western Grocers, Ltd., and the balance from the remaining subsidiaries. Although Loblaw companies has enjoyed sharply rising and substantial earnings, its dividend payout in recent years has been extremely small. Last year, for example, out of earnings of $2.64, it distributed only 40 cents. Thus, as noted, Weston's official statement does not reveal its full stake in the earnings of the Loblaw group.

A word might be pertinent here about Loblaw Groceterias. It boasts the highest net return per dollar of sales of any food chain this side of the Iron Curtain. In part, such impressive profit margins reflect its concentration in the Province of Ontario. They also can be attributed to a tightfisted control over costs, and consumer acceptance of quality merchandise at prices above those of similar products offered by competitors. The chain currently is branching out into western Canada, a move which should be facilitated by Western Grocers' firmly entrenched position in that area.

The latest available balance sheet of George Weston showed a sound financial condition. Current assets totaled $42.3 million, including some $6.6 million in cash, $12.6 million in receivables and almost $23 million in inventories. Current liabilities aggregated $19.4 million; net working capital amounted to $22.9 million, and the current ratio stood at a comfortable 2.2 to 1. Capitalization consists of $16.1 million of long-term debt, including $6.4 million 4¾ percent 15-year debentures, due 1968, and $9.7 million 4¾ percent 15-year debentures, due 1971; $11.6 million 4½ percent cumulative preferred stock; $8 million 6 percent cumulative preferred stock; 1,371,792 shares of class A common and 1,371,792 shares of class B common. The two classes of common are identical, except that the class A shares (traded on the Toronto Exchange) have a small prior dividend right, but no vote. Warrants are outstanding to purchase 300,000 class A shares, at prices ranging from $22.50 to $27 through October 15, 1966.

Through his ownership of the Weston B shares, control of the huge food empire rests in the hands of Willard Garfield Weston, son of the company's founder. It was Mr. Weston, incidentally, who guided the concern to its rapid growth in the thirties. Now living in England, he no longer is active in management of the Canadian company.

Weston's stockholders have received some payment every year since 1930. Since the end of World War II, the annual payout has increased gradually from 15 cents in 1947 to the current 50 cents. (Loblaw has an unbroken dividend skein stretching back to 1925.)

Moreover, it would seem that Weston's 4,500-odd shareholders can anticipate a steadily larger payout as earnings increase. Prospects for growing profits, this year and over the longer term, appear promising. For one thing, the company has demonstrated its ability to prosper in bad times as well as good. Further, its recent diversification within the food business has strengthened greatly both current and potential earning power. Finally, it can be expected to benefit particularly from such trends as an expanding population and the continuing economic development of the Dominion.

*George Weston, Ltd., and subsidiaries other than Loblaw Cos., Ltd., and its subsidiaries, 10-year financial data*

| Year end Dec. 31 | Net operating profit | Depreciation | Interest on funded debt | Taxes on income | Net proceeds after minority interests | Earnings [1] | Dividends [1] | Range [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | | | |
| 1956 | $13.87 | $4.10 | $0.75 | $3.28 | $5.49 | $1.57 | $0.27½ | $36½ to $18¼. |
| 1955 | 11.99 | 4.00 | .60 | 3.20 | 3.93 | .96 | .25 | $37½ to $14¼. |
| 1954 | 11.84 | 3.88 | .60 | 3.36 | 3.36 | .66 | .25 | $16¾ to $8⅜. |
| 1953 | 11.85 | 3.69 | .50 | 3.77 | 3.18 | .65 | .25 | $8⅞ to $6⅝. |
| 1952 | 11.39 | 2.58 | .11 | 4.75 | 3.25 | .64 | .25 | $6¾ to $5. |
| 1951 | 9.39 | 2.40 | .12 | 3.36 | 2.68 | .45 | .21¾ | $6⅜ to $5. |
| 1950 | 9.73 | 2.43 | .14 | 3.13 | 3.06 | .60 | .18¾ | $6 to $4½. |
| 1949 | 8.23 | 1.87 | .14 | 2.68 | 2.62 | .51 | .18¾ | $5 to $3⅞. |
| 1948 | 7.07 | 1.31 | .19 | 2.26 | 2.40 | .47 | .16⅞ | $5¼ to $4⅛. |
| 1947 | 6.88 | .77 | .15 | 2.7 | 2.50 | .48 | .15 | $5⅞ to $4⅞. |

[1] Per common share. Adjusted for 4-for-3 split in 1951 and a 4-for-1 split in 1955.

KEEPING FTC ON JOB IS RECESSION REMEDY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the question the Senate must answer in connection with its consideration of this measure is whether the executive branch and the legislative branch are to rush pellmell to appropriate billions of dollars for plasters to be applied to the recession, or whether they will go to the heart of the disease and apply a remedy. The remedy is clear: It is to keep the Federal Trade Commission on the job as the guardian of the public interest.

If the packers succeed now in having the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission removed from the meat-packing industry, they will also succeed in having the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission removed from the chainstore industry.

The records of the Department of Justice and the records of the Federal Trade Commission show that there have been violations of the antitrust laws. The hearings which this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee has held show that from various quarters innumerable complaints have been received about discriminatory pricing in violation of the antitrust laws, and also about false and misleading advertising, tie-in sales, exclusive contracts, price

fixing, and what are called stabilized-pricing practices.

Oh, how nice it is to use a happy phrase such as "stabilized pricing" for an anti-trust practice, rather than to use the phrase "price fixing." But regardless of whether the price is said to be "stabilized" or "fixed," the consumer is required to pay more, and the producer receives less.

Numerous complaints have also been received about exclusion of competitors, allocation of markets and customers, unlawful rebates and allowances, and mergers.

MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES ARE CRUSHING SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. President, by means of mergers and interlocking directorates—all of which are practices about which complaints have been received—small business is being crushed. That is what we are witnessing today.

Mr. President, is all this just a dream of mine? Indeed not. When President Eisenhower sent his economic message to the Congress, one of the recommendations he made was that the limitation on the life of the Small Business Administration be repealed, so that small businesses might continue to come to the Small Business Administration for loans from the Treasury of the United States. The Treasury borrows the money and pays a steadily increasing rate of interest because the Congress is unwilling to take the acts which necessarily must be taken in order to maintain free, independent enterprise. If the Congress is going to permit small business to wither on the vine, then we may be sure that, as a result, monopoly will take over. There can be no doubt about that. When private management controls the commerce among the States and with foreign nations, free government in the United States of America will have ceased.

MANAGEMENT AND OWNERSHIP HAVE BEEN SEPARATED

Mr. President, these are not figments of the imagination. Mr. Cordiner, the head of the General Electric Co., made a speech before the Columbia University School of Business, in 1955, I believe. The speech should be read by every Member of Congress and by every member of every governmental department. In the course of that speech, Mr. Cordiner said that modern big business had witnessed a great change. He said that the functions of ownership and management had been divided, with the result that one group owns and the other group manages. He pointed out that thousands and thousands of people own small groups of shares of stock—1 share, 5 shares, 10 shares, or 20 shares—and content themselves, so far as management is concerned, merely with signing the proxies which they send to the annual stockholders' meetings, there to be voted by the management, and then the management puts through its own plans by which the managers are rewarded. They are allowed options to buy stock in the company at a particular rate. When the market is "right," they buy the stock; and when the market is "right" again, from their point of view, they sell the stock. Thus they make capital gains, instead of income profits on which they would be required to pay taxes.

Oh, we pay no attention to these pretty devices by which management accumulates, and the poor find it impossible to get out from under the canopy of debt under which they live.

LEADS TO BIG BUSINESS, BIG UNIONS, BIG GOVERNMENT

Big business, if it controls this Government for the rest of this year or for 2 years more, will make inevitable the development of big government.

Twenty years ago, in discussing this matter, I pointed out that the neglect by Congress respecting the issuance by the States, which have no power to regulate interstate commerce of charters of the corporations which carry on that commerce, was leading to the creation of big labor unions, and to the creation of big government. All of this has occurred while Congress has been delegating away its power.

BIG PACKERS FORCING OUT SMALL PACKERS

Now we are confronted once more with the problem of the packers who, through the American Meat Institute, travel up and down the countryside seeking to convince the small packers and the stock growers that they are the custodians of their welfare. Small packers are losing out. The record shows mergers are taking place.

I have in my hand a memorandum on the American Meat Institute which I should like to make a part of this RECORD. It is an association of meatpackers, dominated by the giant packing companies.

The American Meat Institute is an association of meatpackers, dominated by the giant packing companies, and used as an instrument for the promotion of the aims of those companies through public relations campaigns and Federal and State lobbying. While its membership includes about 435 meatpackers, processors, and wholesalers, the representatives of the largest packers have always served in important positions on its board and in its committees. It is financed by dues which are based on the number of livestock each company slaughters, and it is needless to point out that the companies which make the largest contributions are going to control the purse strings of the organization and are going to dominate the policymaking decisions that are made.

When the American Meat Institute reported to the committee on its operations in 1956, all of the top 10 companies, except 1, and practically all of the top 20, were on its board of directors. Its 39 working committees, which do much of the work and make many decisions for the institute, were almost all chaired by representatives of Swift, Armour, Cudahy, Wilson, Morrell, Hormel, Rath, and Oscar Mayer. Only three committees were chaired by representatives of companies other than these companies which are in the top 10. Nine committees were chaired by representatives of Swift, 7 by Hormel, 5 by Armour, 4 by Wilson, 3 each by Rath and Mayer, 2 each by Morrell and Cudahy, and 1 each by 3 smaller companies.

The important legal committee was at the time of the report entirely staffed by representatives of the top 10 packers.

I must repeat that. The legal committee was entirely staffed by members of the management of the top 10 packers—a fine group, indeed, Mr. President, to whom to delegate away the power of Congress to regulate commerce in the meat industry.

Its chairman was Templeton Brown, a private attorney who has represented Swift and other packing companies for many years.

The AMI has spent substantial sums of money for advertising and public relations during recent years, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1951–52 | $2,409,879.20 |
| 1952–53 | 669,148.91 |
| 1953–54 | 886,525.86 |
| 1954–55 | 822,370.10 |
| 1955–56 | 502,393.39 |

I would be interested in getting figures for 1957 and the first 2 months of 1958. Have no doubt about it, I shall get them.

The principal lobbyist for the AMI in recent years has been Aled Davies, who is identified by Wesley McCune in his book, Who's Behind Our Farm Policy (1956), as one of the lobbyists who have been influential in our farm policy. He named Davies as having served as "consultant to Secretary Benson" and "consultant to the Commodity Credit Corporation" during the Eisenhower administration. Davies, he says, has been a personal friend of Secretary Benson for "many years."

I might say Davies has been a friend of mine. Friendship does not necessarily mean influence, of course; but I know very well that he is an influential and able leader of the American Meat Institute, and that he has been represented in person at many of the meetings of the various conventions of stockmen throughout the country.

The Department of Agriculture has stated, in a letter dated January 15, 1958, that Mr. Davies was in fact employed by the Department during the fall of 1953, given the title of expert, and asked to perform advisory and consultative service in connection with the Department's program to promote the consumption of beef.

NONMEAT ACTIVITIES OF BIG PACKERS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a list of the nonmeat activities of large packers.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONMEAT ACTIVITIES OF LARGER PACKERS (A FEW OF THESE PRODUCTS MAY BE DERIVATIVES OF LIVESTOCK)

Swift: Poultry, butter, cheese, margarine, ice cream, like products, eggs, soy beans and peanut oils, cooking oil and other vegetable compounds, sulfuric acid, adhesive, geletin, glycerin, soap, industrial oils, fatty acids.

Armour: Poultry, butter, cheese, eggs, vegetable oils, salad oils, margarine, shortening, soap, toilet articles, glue, glycerin, fatty acids, curled hair, sandpaper, ammonia cylinder-filling operations, tanning of hides, manufacture of leather products, chemicals and pharmaceuticals, fertilizers (including mining of components).

Wilson: Dairy and poultry products, pharmaceuticals, industrial oils, gelatin, hair,

commercial acids, dog and cat food, edible fats and oils, athletic goods, equipment and wear.

Cudahy: Vegetable oils, shortening, cooking and salad oils, eggs, poultry, cheese, cream and butter, margarine, ice cream, mining of rock salt, operating of brine wells.

Morrell: Butter and creamery products, dog and cat food.

MERGERS AMONG PACKERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with respect to mergers, there appears in the printed record, at pages 279 through 289, a tabulation entitled "A Summary of Acquisitions by Packers From 1930 to June 1955." This tabulation covers the mergers and acquisitions accomplished over the years by the larger packers, including the following: Swift, Armour, Wilson, Cudahy, Hygrade, Oscar-Mayer.

Of the 10 packing companies listed, the tabulation shows that a grand total of 320 independent companies were acquired, with businesses ranging from packing and slaughtering plants and dairy products to general business unrelated to the packing industry, as shown at page 279 of the report.

Why, these mergers constitute vast empires, just as Barron's Weekly denominated George Weston, Ltd., a vast food empire.

The protection of the right of the people to produce living food or planted food upon the land and sell it in a free market is involved. That opportunity today is being taken away from them by the monopolistic growth of big business.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HAS NOT INVESTIGATED MERGERS

None of the witnesses interrogated during the hearings had any information concerning possible investigation by the Department of Agriculture concerning the effect on competition which such mergers and acquisitions have had. Mr. E. F. Forbes, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., testified as follows on this point:

> Although the Department of Agriculture has the responsibility to investigate mergers which tend to create monopoly powers, it was brought out at the hearings before this subcommittee last July that the Packers and Stockyards Branch has never investigated a single merger in the meatpacking industry.

That testimony is taken from page 100 of the report.

The record is clear that the Department of Agriculture has never undertaken a formal proceeding for the purpose of limiting or preventing the merger trend. Yet the Congress, in enacting the Packers and Stockyards Act, charged the Department of Agriculture with the principal responsibility with reference to these types of practices in the meatpacking industry.

Mr. Angus McDonald, assistant legislative secretary of the National Farmers Union, was aware of this problem when he appeared as a witness before the subcommittee. Commencing at page 150 of the printed record, there appears a careful study of vertical mergers which have occurred in the industry. It is a most interesting analysis and I commend it to Senators. At page 156, Mr. McDonald states in part:

> Studies of the Federal Trade Commission indicate that every great wave of mergers, of which there have been several since the turn of the century, are accompanied by skyrocketing profits. * * * Attention is called to the fact that during the same period when wheat and dairy farmers and livestock growers were experiencing the most drastic decline in profits since 1952, that profits of these corporations, processors and products were increasing by leaps and bounds. Recent disastrous price declines have wiped out thousands of farmers and have endangered the solvency of hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions.

FARM PROBLEM UNSOLVED

Oh, Mr. President, we talk about the farm problem and the fact that it has not been solved. It has not been solved. It has not been solved during this administration or during preceding administrations.

I remember when President Coolidge and President Hoover vetoed farm-relief bills passed by Republican Congresses because the power of these concentrated mergers was so great that the groups were able to overcome the minds of Congressmen.

The time has come when Congress should do something to solve the farm problem and set the individual farmer free from the totalitarian economic dictation under which he now suffers. We should free the Government from the necessity of levying taxes upon the people to raise billions of dollars to pay farm benefits, subsidies, Soil Bank payments and the like, which do no good.

INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN MORE IMPORTANT THAN CORPORATION

The time has come when we should return to sound American principles of freedom, political and economic freedom. I am confident that before we finish with the bill under consideration in the present session of Congress we shall have acquainted all the country, from coast to coast, with the fact that the individual comes first, that the individual citizen is more important than the artificial corporation, and that Congress itself must prescribe the manner in which regulation shall take place.

Such prescription has already been made. It is the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PACKERS SUBJECT TO PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

With these words, Mr. President, I conclude; but first I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point a document from the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Livestock Division, June 17, 1957, giving a list of packers subject to the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended. The list gives all who have been listed as subject to the act. I have arranged to have marked all the companies which are obviously not packers but are, instead, food operators, giant chains, organizations which desire to escape the regulation of unfair trade and monopolistic practices set forth in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF PACKERS SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, 1921, AS AMENDED

A A Hotel & Restaurant Supply Co., Inc., 2025 Gravois Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

A. B. C. Packing Co., 1709 Fifth Street, Wichita Falls, Tex.

Aberdeen Packing Plant, Box 235, Aberdeen, N. C.

Ace Packing House, 20137 Denquire, Detroit, Mich.

Acme Meat Co., Inc., 4366 Alcoa Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

Ralph & Paul Adams, Bridgeville, Del.

S. Adams Packing Co., 4900 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo.

Addonizio Bros., 156 Salem Street, Boston, Mass.

The J. C. Adler Co., Inc., West Jefferson and Bluff, Joliet, Ill.

Akins & Fincannon Packing Co., Box 216, Sand Springs, Okla.

The Akron Standard Market Co., 198 Wooster Avenue, Akron, Ohio.

Agar Packing & Provision Corp., 4057 South Union Street, Chicago, Ill.

Airways Supply Co., Box 117, Kenner, La.

Ajax Meat Packing Co., 3320 East Vernon, Los Angeles, Calif.

Albert Packing Co., Inc., Chartiers Street, Washington, Pa.

Emil Alinikoff, 92 South Pennsylvania Avenue, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

James Allan & Sons, Evans Avenue and Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Allen Brothers, Inc., 3737-39 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.

Allendale Beef Co., R. D. No. 3, Hudsonville, Mich.

AllFresh Food Products, Inc., 2156 Green Bay Road, Evanston, Ill.

J. H. Allison & Co., Middle Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Almeida & Cabral, Inc., 156 Fifth Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Alpha Beta Packing Co., 17311 Nicols Avenue, Huntington Beach, Calif.

Alpine Meat Pack, Inc., 1100 West 6894 South, North Salt Lake, Utah.

Alpine Packing Co., Route 2, Box 411, Stockton, Calif.

Alta Meat Co., Post Office Box 428, Dinuba, Calif.

Louis Altberger, 5600 York Street, Denver, Colo.

Amarillo Packing Co., 1809 Northeast Third Avenue, Amarillo, Tex.

Samuel Amdorsky, 150 Joseph Avenue, Rochester, N. Y.

Amend Packing Co., 410 Southeast 18th Street, Des Moines, Iowa.

American Home Foods, 40 Hanover Avenue, Morris Plains, N. J.

American Packing Co., 3858 Garfield Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

American Kosher Products, Inc., 1188-1190 Blue Hill Avenue, Dorchester, Mass.

American Stores Co., 124 North 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Anderson Abattoir, Box 626, Anderson, S. C.

Anderson & Tarlow, Inc., 486 Austin Place, Bronx, N. Y.

J. S. Anderson Packing Co., Inc., 510 West Hackley Avenue, Muskegon, Mich.

Fred L. Andrews Estate, R. D. No. 2, Box 403, Nazareth, Pa.

Anker Meat Co., Post Office Box 873, Modesto, Calif.

Apache Packing Co., 1500 Tampico Street, San Antonio, Tex.

Apex Packing Co., 916-918 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.

Arbogast & Bastian, Inc., 1-31 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

Arcadia Packing House, 727 Blue Island Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. J. Archie & Sons, Inc., 626–630 Howard Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Armour & Co., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
Gilbert P. Arnold & Sons, Oak Tree Road, Iselin, N. J.
Arnurius, Dunn & Co., 236–242 Pleasant Street, Hartford, Conn.
Wm. Aronson, 211 Maple Street, Glens Falls, N. Y.
Arrow Meat Co., Cornelius, Oreg.
The Arvada Packing Co., Arvada, Colo.
Associated Meat Packers, Inc., 8349 North Vancouver Avenue, Portland, Oreg.
Astor Abattoir, Inc., 324 Astor Street, Newark, N. J.
Atacosa Packing Co., Pleasanton, Tex.
Atlas Packing Co., 1515 East Seventh Street, Tulsa, Okla.
Atlas Packing Co., Inc., 3501 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Auburn Packing Co., Inc., Box 519, Auburn, Wash.
Ed Auge Packing Co., 1305 South Brazos Street, San Antonio, Tex.
Auth Sausage Co., Inc., 1260 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
Autin Packing Co., Inc., Corner School and Canal Streets, Houma, La.
Avera Provision Co., Olive Road, Augusta, Ga.
Avon Packing Co., Route No. 2, Mount Vernon, Wash.
B & M Packing Co., West of City, Burley, Idaho.
B & W Packing Co., 205 Second Street, East, Lemmon, S. Dak.
L. H. Babb, Ivor, Va.
Bacino-Pizza Food Products Corp., 546 Ingraham Avenue, Calumet City, Ill.
Bacon Crisp Co., 24434 West Warren Avenue, Dearborn, Mich.
Baconette Products, 1925 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
Balentine Packing Co., Inc., Box 1590, Greenville, S. C.
John Ballek, RFD 1, Riegelsville, Pa.
Baltz Bros. Packing Co., Elm Hill Road, Nashville, Tenn.
Charles Banfield Co., 1443 North Cincinnati, Tulsa, Okla.
Banfield Frozen Food Co., 30 Lewis, Tulsa, Okla.
Barnes Provision, Inc., Road 1, Alliance, Ohio.
Harry Barr & Son, 55 L. W. 12th Street, New York, N. Y.
Bartels Packing Co., Cottage Grove, Oreg.
G. Bartusch Packing Co., 567 North Cleveland Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.
Basin Packing Co., Post Office Box 78, Durango, Colo.
Kayseri Basterma Co., 4 Vassar Road, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Jacob Bauer's Sons, Inc., 2870 Massachusetts Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Max Bauer Meat Packer, 330 West 23d Street, Post Office Box 704, Hialeah, Fla.
D. S. Baum, Route 3, Elizabethtown, Pa.
Baum Packing Co., 4124 West Natural Bridge, St. Louis, Mo.
H. P. Beale & Sons, Courtland, Va.
J. W. Beardsley's Sons, 696–702 Frelinghuysen Avenue, Newark, N. J.
Beasley Packing Co., Inc., of Florida, Post Office Box 1501, Pensacola, Fla.
Beasley Packing Co., Inc., Box 246, Hattiesburg, Miss.
Beaver Valley Packing Co., 1215 Fifth Street, New Brighton, Pa.
Beaver's Meats, Route 3, London Road, Delaware, Ohio.
Beavers Packing Co., Newman, Ga.
Bechtols, Orrville, Ohio.
Beck Provision Co., 82 Abbott Road, Buffalo, N. Y.
L. Beck & Sons, 3829 Morgan Street, Chicago, Ill.
Beck Bros., 361 Tilghman Street, Allentown, Pa.
Becwar Packing Co., North 601 Freya Street, Spokane, Wash.
Beech-Nut Life Savers, Inc., Canajoharie, N. Y.
Edward F. Beicke, 1195 William Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Beinecke, Inc., 821–825 Washington Street, New York, N. Y.
Belvedere, Inc., 5580 Utica Road, Fraser, Mich.
Berchem's Meat Co., Post Office Box 102, Niles, Calif.
David Berg & Co., 163–167 South Water Market, Chicago, Ill.
William Bergin, 3800 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Frances E. Bergman, 3620 Linden Avenue, Dayton, Ohio.
Bergman Packing Co., Griggsville, Ill.
Edward G. Berlett & Sons, Inc., 263 South Conkling Street, Baltimore, Md.
Berks Packing Co., Inc., 307–323 Bingman Street, Reading, Pa.
Louis M. Berman, Inc., 38 Colfax Street, Pawtucket, R. I.
Berman Food Products Co., 47 Waverly Avenue, Newark, N. J.
Bernhard's Sausage Co., Inc., 2433 North 20th Street, Post Office Box 54, Sheboygan, Wis.
Schmulka Bernstein & Co., Inc., 107–109 Rivington Street, New York, N. Y.
Berry Packing Co., 400 Medio Street, San Antonio, Tex.
Max Besbris, 1881 Ravine Road, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Best Kosher Sausage Co., 3527–3529 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, Ill.
Beste Provision Co., 115 Logan Street, Wilmington, Del.
Betbeze Bros., 705 23d Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
Bethlehem Packing Co., 610 Wyandotte Street, Bethlehem, Pa.
Bettinger & Barnett, 1459 East Kirby, Detroit, Mich.
Beverly Meat & Locker, 613 East Pacific, Salina, Kans.
Curt Biastock Wholesale Meats, 1300 Centennial Avenue, Butte, Mont.
Biffs Steaks, Inc., 1621 30th Street NE., Canton, Ohio.
A. Bills & Co., South Main Street, Midvale, Utah.
Bilt-More Food Prod. Co., Inc., 1034 Howell Mill Road NW., Atlanta, Ga.
Bird Provision Co., Powerton Road, Pekin, Ill.
Birds Eye Division, General Foods Corp., Clarke Avenue, Pocomoke City, Md.
Black Hills Packing Co., Rapid City, S. Dak.
Blaskovics, Inc., 1101 West Walnut Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Morris Blinder & Co., Inc., 32 North Street, Boston, Mass.
Bloomfield Packing Co., 2108–2114 East Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Bloomington Packing Co., Inc., West Sixth Street, Bloomington, Ind.
Blue Grass Provision Co., Inc., 309–315 West 12th Street, Covington, Ky.
Blue Ribbon Packing Co., Inc., 4767 Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
Blue Star Foods, Inc., 501 West Broadway, Council Bluffs, Iowa.
Blumenstein Packing House, Lebanon, Ill.
J. J. Boeckmann & Son Packing Co., 1218 Keowee Street, Dayton, Ohio.
Bogart Packing Co., Inc., 300 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Boise Valley Packing Co., Eagle, Idaho.
E. R. Boliantz, 1276 Main Street South, Mansfield, Ohio.
John Boll & Son, 318 South Fourth Street, Ironton, Ohio.
S. Bonaccurso & Sons., 1426–1438 South Front Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bongiorni Bros., Box 406, Slovan, Pa.
Bonnee Frozen Products Co., 8144 Olive Street Road, St. Louis, Mo.
Bon Ton Saratoga Chip Distributors, Rear 1229 D Street SE., Washington, D. C.
Antonio Bonuomo, 912 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bookey Packing Co., Southeast 18th and Scott, Des Moines, Iowa.
Boone County Packing Co., Rural Route 3, Lebanon, Ind.
Border City Packing Co., 110 North C Street, Fort Smith, Ark.
August Born & Son, 2250 North Teutonia Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Bornstein & Pearl Provision Co., Inc., 196 Quincy Street, Roxbury, Mass.
Boston Brokerage Co., 148 State Street, Boston, Mass.
Boston Sausage & Provision Co., Constitution Wharf, Boston, Mass.
Bouckaert Packing Co., 218 Sidney Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Bourbon-Bell Corp., 3449 West 48th Place, Chicago, Ill.
Bovalina Packing Co., 9 Main Street, Slovan, Pa.
Frank B. Bowman Co., 6 Abattoir Road, Brighton, Mass.
Bracco & Co., 768 North Commercial Street, Trinidad, Colo.
A. Bradnan, 3183 West 65th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Brander Meat Co., 915 North Columbia Boulevard, Portland, Oreg.
Brandes & Trautman, Elmore, Ohio.
B. Brauer's Sons, stalls 7 and 9, Sixth Street Market, Richmond, Va.
Otto C. Brauer, First Market, stalls 13 and 14, Richmond Va.
Braun Bros. Packing Co., Troy, Ohio.
P. J. Breish & Son, 816 Noble Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
P. Brennan, 231 Lewis Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
The P. Brennan Co., 3927–43 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Brest Packing Co., Fourth and Walnut Streets, Shamokin, Pa.
Bridgeford Packing Co., Post Office Box 552, Anaheim, Calif.
Bridwell Packing Co., Post Office Box 584, Kingsport, Tenn.
Bridwell Packing House, Box 814, Bluefield, W. Va.
Briggs & Co., 454 11th Street SW., Washington, D. C.
Otto Briick Sons, 466 North Chicago Street, Joliet, Ill.
Bristol Packing Co., 204 Carssow Building, Lewiston, Idaho.
Britt Packing Co., 1517 West 59th Street, Shreveport, La.
M. Brizer & Co., 1515 Drinker Street, Dunmore, Pa.
Broadway Meat Packers and Provisioners, 501 North Culberhouse Street, Jonesboro, Ark.
Barnet Brodie, Inc., 123–5–7 Walton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Brodsky Packing Co., Spearfish, S. D.
Bronx Meat Co., 440 West 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
The Brooks Packing Co., Post Office Box 1942, Lake Station, Tulsa, Okla.
Broken Bow Packing Co., Rural Free Delivery 3, Broken Bow, Nebr.
M. Bronich, RD 2, West Middlesex Pa.
Brothro Food Products, Inc., d/b/a Richter's Food Products, Inc., 1040 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.
V. L. Brousse Co., 162 Esteben Street, Arabi, La.
John H. Brown, 3514 North Eighth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Brown Packing Co., 158th and Greenwood Avenue, South Holland, Ill.
Brown & Edwards Packing Co., Route 1, Alexandria, La.
Brown Packing Co., Inc., 6900 West Capitol Avenue, Post Office Box 2378, Little Rock, Ark.
Brown Bros., RD 1, Fairview, Pa.

Brown's Meats, 1606 E. Franklin Street, Richmond, Va.
Frank Bruno, 1039 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bryan Bros. Packing Co., West Point, Miss.
Bryan Bros. Packing Co., 2105 Morris Avenue., Birmingham, Ala.
Bryan & English Packing Co., Box 481, Edinburg, Tex.
Bryan Meat Co., Post Office Box 822, South River Road, Paso Robles, Calif.
Bryan Sausage Co., Downsville, La.
Aaron Buchsbaum Co., 729–731 Ninth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Buitoni Foods Corp., 450 Huyler Street, South Hackensack, N. J.
Bullock Manufacturing Co., 317 Whitehall Street SW., Atlanta, Ga.
Z. B. Bulluck & Son, 131 Washington, Rocky Mount, N. C.
Bunzel's Wholesale Veal, 2344 South 27th Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Buon Gusto Sausage Factory, 535 Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Russell Buono, 133 Cherry Tree Lane, Merchantville, N. J.
Fred Burger & Co., 1815 John Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Burger Bros., 551 St. Joseph Street, Lancaster, Pa.
Buring Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 267, Wilson, Ark.
Nat Buring Packing Co., Inc., 313 South Wagner Place, Memphis, Tenn.
Louis Burk Co., Girard Avenue and Third Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Burkholder Bros., Lebanon, Pa.
Burlison Packing Co., Old Petrolia Road, Wichita Falls, Tex.
Burham & Morrill Co., 45 Water Street, Portland, Maine.
Burns Packing Co., 140 Power Road, Grand Junction, Colo.
Burton Bros., 4773 Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
Roy Burton, Wholesale Meats, Route 3, North Little Rock, Ark.
H. F. Busch Co., 4756 Paddock Road, Cincinnati, Ohio.
W. H. Butcher Packing Co., 101 Southeast Eighth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Butler Packing Co., 505 Negley Avenue, Butler, Pa.
C. J. D. Packing Co., Inc., 88 Holt Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
C. & N. Livestock Co., 118 Milan Street, Houston,Tex.
C. & R. Beef Co., 84 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Cadwell, Martin Meat Co., Post Office Box 615, Hanford, Calif.
Claude Cady Slaughterhouse, Osborne, Kans.
Caffee & Branum Wholesale Meat Co., Post Office Box 1153, Lubbock, Tex.
Calabrese Food Products, Inc., 900 Wentworth Avenue, Toronto, Ohio.
Caldwell Packing Co., Windom, Minn.
Vernon Calhoun Packing Co., Route 1, Palestine, Tex.
Calihan & Co., Box 1176, Peoria, Ill.
The Cambria Packing Co., Jackson, Ohio.
Camel Bros., 5747 North Peters Street, New Orleans, La.
Camp Packing Co., Inc., West Homer Road, Cortland, N. Y.
S. M. Campbell, Gray, Ky.
Campbell Bros., 1271 Jackson Pike, Columbus, Ohio.
Campbell Soup Co., Southwest Corner Second and Market Streets, Camden, N. J.
Canadian Valley Meat Co., 1240 Southwest 15th Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.
The Canton Provision Co., Carnahan Avenue NE., Canton, Ohio.
Capitol Beef & Provision Co., Inc., 117 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Capitol Kosher Sausage & Prov. Co., 77 I Street SE., Washington, D. C.
Capitol Packing Co., 5000 Clarkson Street, Denver, Colo.
Cappellino's Abattoir, Inc., 108 West Main Street, Gouverneur, N. Y.
Domenico Cappuccio, 1019 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Capri Table Products Co., Inc., 1342 39th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
The Carel Corp., 18 North Virginia Avenue, Penns Grove, N. J.
Carey Packing Co., Post Office Box 308, Morristown, Tenn.
Cariani Sausage Co., 2424 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Carnation Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
Carolina Packers, Inc., Smithfield, N. C.
Rex Carpenter, RD. 1, Townville, Pa.
Carr Packing Co., Inc., 410 South Pearl Street, Albany, N. Y.
Carr Packing Co., Inc., 1 Niver Street, Cohoes, N. Y.
Carson Packing Co., 17 South Water Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Carter Packing Co., Buhl, Idaho.
Cascade Meats, Inc., Post Office Box 390, 2805 Valpak Road, Salem, Oreg.
Case Pork Roll Co., Inc., 644 Washington Street, Trenton, N. J.
Casey Packing Co., Gail Route, Big Spring, Tex.
Castleberry's Food Co., Inc., 1621 15th Street, Augusta, Ga.
Anthony Catelli, 622–24 Federal Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
CeeBee Packing Co., 944 West 38th Place, Chicago, Ill.
Central Beef Co., 1 Newmarket Square and 225 Southampton Street, Boston, Mass.
Central Falls Provision Co., Inc., 847 High Street, Central Falls, R. I.
Central Meat Co., 824 West 38th Place, Chicago, Ill.
Central New York Packing Co., Inc., 2217 Dwyer Avenue, Utica, N. Y.
Central Packing Co., Highway 20, Alexandria, La.
Central Packing Co., Box 262, Cape Girardeau, Mo.
Central Packing Co., South 24th and Frisco Tracks, Muskogee, Okla.
Central Packing Co., Old Burk Road, Wichita Falls, Tex.
Central Packing Co., 300 Central Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
Central Packing Corp., 352 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Century Packing Co., 3301 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Certified Provision Corp., 500 Broadway, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Champion Foods Division of the Frito Co., 2827 Nagle, Dallas, Tex.
Madam Chang Foods Co., 410 Edmond Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Chapman & Chapman, Middleport, N. Y.
Charney Meat Co., 143–155 Addison Street, East Boston, Mass.
Chattanoga Sausage Co., Inc., 1801 Rossville Avenue, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Cherokee Packing Co., Gaffney, S. C.
Cherry-Levis Food Products Co., 424–26 Christian Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Cherry Meat Packers, Inc., 4750 South California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Chet's Foods, Inc., 2639 Elizabeth Street, Pueblo, Colo.
Mike Chiapetti Co., 3810 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Chicago Dressed Meat Co., 529 Westchester Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Chilli-O Frozen Foods Inc., 311 North Aberdeen Street, Chicago, Ill.
Chilco Quick Freeze, Clanton, Ala.
Christensen Meat Co., Inc., Post Office Box 152, Tillamook, Oreg.
Churchill Meat Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Cianciulli Bros., Inc., 507–11 Carpenter Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Cimpl's, Inc., 321–323 Broadway, Yankton, S. Dak.
Ciralski Packing Co., 21 North Superior Street, Toledo, Ohio.
Circle Packing Corp., 319 Winstanley Avenue, East St. Louis, Ill.
Circle T Meat Co., 2828 North Haskell, Dallas, Tex.
City Beef Company of Bridgeport, Inc., Asylum Street, Bridgeport, Conn.
City Dressed Beef, 3131 North 31st Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
City Line Abattoir, 339 Florida Grove Road, Perth Amboy, N. J.
City Meat Market, 514 Cedar Street, Wallace, Idaho.
City Packing Co., Inc., 115 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
City Packing Co., 1931 South 96th Street, Seattle, Wash.
City Packing Co., Inc., Box 1672, Fort Worth, Tex.
Claridge Food Co., Inc., 41–23 Murray Street, Flushing, N. Y.
Claire Mont Packing Co., Wagner Street, Chippewa Falls, Wis.
H. G. Clark Provision Co., Stillwater Avenue, Dennison, Ohio.
Clark's Packing Plant, Eighth Street and Santa Fe Avenue, Fowler, Colo.
Clayton Packing Co., 4303–05 West Clayton Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Roy Clement & Son, Salem, Mich.
Clougherty Packing Co., 3049 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Clover Beef Co., 820 North Christian Street, Lancaster, Pa.
Clover Packing Co., Inc., 426 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.
Wm. Coady & Co., 211 North Green Street, Chicago, Ill.
Coast Packing Co., 3275 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Coffeyville Packing Co., Inc., Coffeyville, Kans.
Jacob Cohen Beef Co., Inc., 14 Brighton Abattoir, Brighton, Mass.
Louis Cohen, 159 East Main Street, Newark, N. J.
Cohen's Famous Knishes, 631 Frelinghuysen Avenue, Newark, N. J.
Sam Cohen, 9435 Peterson, Detroit, Mich.
Colfax Packing Co., 34 Colfax Street, Pawtucket, R. I.
College Inn Food Products Co., 4301 South Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Colonial Beef Co., 409 North Franklin Street and 303 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Colonial Corned Beef Co., 137 South Water Market, Chicago, Ill.
Colonial Packing Co., Northwest 13th Street, Boca Raton, Fla.
Colonial Provision Co., Inc., 1100 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston, Mass.
Colorado Packing Co., Inc., La Junta, Colo.
Columbia Corned Beef Co. and Columbia Packing Co., 1233–37 George Street, Chicago, Ill.
Columbia Packing, 155 Southhampton Street, Boston, Mass.
Columbia Packing Co., 2807 East 11th Street, Dallas, Tex.
Commercial Beef Co., 124 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Commercial Packing Co., Inc., 3811 South Soto Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
Community Cold Storage, Torrington, Wyo.
Concord Dressed Beef & Veal Co., 45 Concord Street, Pawtucket, R. I.
Cones Market & Cold Storage, 109 East Main, Grangeville, Idaho.
Connecticut Packing Co., Bloomfield, Conn.
Consolidated Dressed Beef Co., Inc., Grays Ferry Avenue and 36th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Consolidated Packing Co., Inc., 132 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Consolidated Rendering Co., 178 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass.
B. Constantino & Sons Co., East Taintor Lane, Rural Route 5, Springfield, Ill.
P. Conti & Sons, Inc., Henrietta, N. Y.

Continental Packing Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Continental Sausage Co., 540 Dartmouth Street, South Dartmouth, Mass.
Cook Packing Plant, Post Office Box 763, Concord, N. C.
Cook's Foods, Inc., 1223 South Atherton Street, State College, Pa.
Corley Packing Co., Copley, Ohio.
Cornell Provision Co., 1411–1413 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Cornhusker Packing Co., 4436 Dahlman Boulevard, Omaha, Nebr.
J. Lynn Cornwell, Inc., Purcellville, Va.
Ed. K. Corrigan & Son Meat Packers, 607 15th Avenue, Council Bluffs, Iowa.
Corsair Packing Co., 74 Concord Street, Pawtucket, R. I.
Corte & Co., 414 Hoboken Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.
Crawford Packing Co., 717 North San Jacinto Street, Houston, Tex.
Crayton's Products, Inc., 2746 East 53d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Creaghe Packing Co., Lamar, Colo.
C. & M. Creitz Co., Newton Hamilton, Pa.
James Crixci, Route 4, New Castle, Pa.
Cross Bros. Meat Packers, Inc., 3600 North Front St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Howard E. Crossan, Marshallton, Del.
The Crosse & Blackwell Co., 6801 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Crowgey Sausage Co., Kellysville, W. Va.
Crown Packing Co., 88 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Crown Packing Co., 1561 Adelaide Street, Detroit, Mich.
Crown Pork Products, 11208 Avalon Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
Cudahy Brothers Co., Milwaukee County, Cudahy, Wis.
Cudahy Packing Co., Union Stock Yards, Omaha, Nebr.
Cudney & Co., 400 North Orleans Street, Chicago, Ill.
Cuellar Foods, Inc., 162 Leslie Street, Dallas, Tex.
Curtis Packing Co., P. O. Drawer 1470, Greensboro, N. C.
Cushing Packing & Provision Co., Cushing, Okla.
Cushman Food Co., 700 Block Williamsburg Street, Aiken, S. C.
Custom Meat Packing Co., 515 East 45th Street, Boise, Idaho.
Custom Packing Co., Inc., 1015 Street Patrick, Rapid City, S. Dak.
Custom Packing Co., Box 721, Twin Falls, Idaho.
Cuyamaca Meata, 1200 West Main Street, El Cajon, Calif.
D. & W. Packing Co., South State Line, Texarkana, Tex.
John R. Daily, Inc., 115–119 West Front Street, Missoula, Mont.
Dakota Packing Co., Stockyards, Jamestown, N. Dak.
Dallas City Packing Co., Morrell Road, Route 2, Box 806, Dallas, Tex.
A. F. Damaske, 1694 South Pearl Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
The Danahy Packing Co., 25 Metcalfe Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Daniel Bros., Inc., Columbia City, Ind.
Danville Meat Supply, Inc., 546 Craghead Street, Danville, Va.
Davenport Packing Co., Inc., Milan, Ill.
Davidowitz Kosher Provision Co., 123 Walton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
David Meat Co., P. O. Box 154, Santa Clara, Calif.
David Davies, Inc., 616 West Mound Street, Columbus, Ohio.
The William Davies Co., 41st Street and Union Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Edward Davis, Inc., 420 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.
Davis Meat Co., Box 2836, Boise, Idaho.
The Daw Packing Co., Inc., 180 Oak Street, New Haven, Conn.

CIV——324

Dawson-Spatz Packing Co., Inc., 1227 Lexington Road, Louisville, Ky.
The Dayton Packing Co., 46 Rappee Avenue, Dayton, Ohio.
George Dealman, Mt. View Road, Warren Township, Plainfield, N. J.
Dean Pack and/or Sioux Locker Co., West Main, Vermillion, S. Dak.
Dearborn Meat Co., 2035 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
Val Decker Packing Co., 727 East Ash Street, Piqua, Ohio
Decker & Son, 1500 Arch Street, Colorado Springs, Colo.
Dedeaux Packing Co., Route 2, Box 297, Gulfport, Miss.
Earl Dehn, Route 1, Amherst, Ohio.
Herman Deile, Inc., 82–86 Jackson Street, Hoboken, N. J.
Del Monte Meat Co., 303 Southeast Oak Street, Portland, Oreg.
Delano Packing Co., Delano, Minn.
Del Ray Packing Co., 9374 Copeland Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Delaware Packing Co., Route 3, Delaware, Ohio
Delaware Packing Co., 205 Bloomsbury Street, Trenton, N. J.
Delfrate Packing Co., Box 276, Slovan, Pa.
Delta Packing Co., 1019 Fourth Street, Clarksdale, Miss.
E. Demakes & Co., Inc., 37 Waterhill Street, Lynn, Mass.
Deming Packing Co., Deming, N. Mex.
Denholm Packing Co., 6670 Transit Way, Pittsburgh, Pa.
The Denver Tamale & Supply Co., Inc., 1050 10th Street, Denver, Colo.
Denver Wholesale Meat Co., 2701–06 West Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colo.
Wm. H. Deruff & Co., 1246 Hargest Lane, Baltimore, Md.
De Schepper Packing Co., Knoxville Road, R. R. No. 1, Milan, Ill.
Des Moines Packing Co., 1700 Maury Street, Des Moines, Iowa.
Detroit Packing Co., 1120 Springwells Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Detroit Veal & Lamb, Inc., 1540 Division Street, Detroit, Mich.
Detwiler's Abattoir, Road 2, Pottstown, Pa.
Dewig Bros., Haubstadt, Ind.
Diamond F. Meat Co., Inc., 1336 Commerce Street, Tacoma, Wash.
A. Di Cillo & Sons, Inc., Route No. 322, Mayfield Road, Chesterland, Ohio.
Dickinson & Co., Post Office Box 755, Lafayette, Ind.
Dietz & Watson, Inc., 115 Vine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Edward Dillon, Wyoming, N. Y.
Gaetano Di Pascale Sons, 920 South 9th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Frank Di Pietro, 902 South 9th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ditzler Bros., 28 Wood Street, Pine Grove, Pa.
Division Packing Co., 1566 Division Street, Detroit, Mich.
Dixie Frozen Foods, Inc., 15 Waddell Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.
Dixie Packing Co., Inc., 221 Mehle Avenue, Arabi, La.
Dixon Packing Co., 106–110 Milam Street, Houston, Tex.
Harry Dobrowitsky, 2966 Cortland Street, Detroit, Mich.
Joe Doctorman & Son, Inc., 2900 South 2d West, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Doehne Provision Co., Box 53, Clarkwood, Texas.
Fred Dold & Sons Packing Co., 421 21st Street, Wichita, Kans.
Donelson Packing Co., 366 Frederick Street, Carey, Ohio.
Donner Commission Co., 1915 West Canal Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Dorset Foods, Ltd., 44–02 23d Street, Long Island City, N. Y.
Dreher Packing Co., Inc., Broad River Road, Columbia, S. C.
Paul Dressler, 1230 Wyoming Avenue, Exeter, Pa.
Drummond Meat Co., 116 West Water, Chillicothe, Ohio.
Dubuque Packing Co., 16th and Sycamore Streets, Dubuque, Iowa.
Duffy-Mott Co., Inc., 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Dugdale Packing Co., 11th & Bell, St. Joseph, Mo.
Dukeland Packing Co., Inc., 1050–60 South Dukeland Street, Baltimore, Md.
Dunn-Ostertag Packing Co., 800 East 21st Street, Wichita, Kans.
Du Quoin Packing Co., Du Quoin, Ill.
Durham Meat Co., Inc., Mariposa & Villa Street, Mountain View, Calif.
Durkee Famous Food, Inc., 3702 Iron Street, Chicago, Ill.
Ernest Dutcher, 207 Cottage Street, Whitewater, Wis.
Dwares Provision Co., 58 Washington Street, Pawtucket, R. I.
Dykstra Bros., Route 5, 128 Cummings Avenue, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Joe Dzapo, Route 1, Box 381, Brookfield, Ohio.
Eagle Brand Products, Inc., 122 Jane Street, New York, N. Y.
Eagle Packing Co., 4402 South 35th Street, Omaha, Nebr.
East Carson Packing Co., East Carson Street, Hays, Pa.
East Tennessee Packing Co., 200 Jones Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
Eastern Boneless Beef Co., 724 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Eastern Market Pork Products Co., 10023 West Fort Street, Detroit, Mich.
Eastern Oregon Meat Co., Inc., Baker, Oreg.
Eastern Packing Co., Inc., 1215½ Silver Lane, East Hartford, Conn.
Eastern Packing Co., Inc., 416 East Linden Avenue, Linden, N. J.
The Eastern Shore Provision Co., Lewes, Del.
Eatwell Provisions, Inc., 646 Bergen Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Ebner Bros. Packers, 100 Walnut Street, Wichita Falls, Tex.
E. Eckerlin, Inc., 1817 John Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Eckert Packing Co., Route 7, Defiance, Ohio.
Economy Meat Market, 92 Prince Street, Boston, Mass.
Edmond's Chile Co., Inc., 3236 Oregon Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Lee Edson, Hudsonville, Mich.
Edwin Beef Co., 5140 Edwin Street, Hamtramck, Mich.
Elburn Packing Co. of Illinois, 309 West Nebraska Street, Elburn, Ill.
Eldridge Packing Co., 28 North Second Street, Kansas City, Kans.
Eldridge Packing Co., Post Office Box 874, La Grande, Oreg.
Merlin Eliason, 219 North Fourth West, Logan, Utah.
Elizabethville Abattoir, Elizabethville, Pa.
Elk Grove Meat Co., Elk Grove, Calif.
Elkhart Packing Co., Box 304, Elkhart, Ind.
Elliott Packing Co., Post Office Box 458, Duluth, Minn.
Ellis Canning Co., 1575 Alcott Street, Denver, Colo.
Elm Grove Packing Co., 529 Mine Street, Elm Grove, W. Va.
Emge Packing Co., Fort Branch, Ind.
Emmart Food Products, Co., 4701 South Christiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Emmart Packing Co., 1202 Story Avenue, Louisville, Ky.
Emmert Meat Co., West Fourth Street, Emmett, Idaho.
Emmite Meat Co., Inc., Post Office Box 2547, 4821 Calhoun, Houston, Tex.
Empire Packing Corp., 74 Concord Street, Pawtucket, R. I.
Emporia Packing Co., Rural Route 4, Emporia, Kans.

Engelberg Packing Co., 1186 Riverside, Memphis, Tenn.
John Engelhorn & Sons., 17–27 Avenue L, Newark, N. J.
Engelhorn Packing Co., 2011 Eighth Street, North Bergen, N. J.
H. R. Englebeck & Sons, Rural Free Delivery 1, Port Clinton, Ohio.
Enid Packing Co., 2424 North Madison Street, Enid, Okla.
T. E. Epperson & Co., Charleston, Tenn.
David Epstein Co., 83 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Eremic's Provisions, 54 Valley Street, Box 193, Pitcairn, Pa.
G. Erhardt's Sons, Inc., 545 Poplar Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Essem Packing Co., 101 Beacon Street, Lawrence, Mass.
Robert L. Estes, Baird, Tex.
Estes Bros. Packing Co., 506 Northeast 37th Street, Box 4561, Fort Worth, Tex.
E–TEX Packing Co., Post Office Drawer 152, Mount Pleasant, Tex.
Eugster's Market, 2201 30th Street, Southwest Birmingham, Ala.
European Kosher Provision Mfg., Co., 6 Spring Street, Baltimore, Md.
The Evans Packing Co., Inc., Box 301, Callipolis, Ohio.
Evergood Meat Co., Inc., 610 Bergen Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Excel Packing Co., 900 East 21st Street, Wichita, Kans.
Excelsior Quick Frosted Meat Products, Inc., 128 Sheriff Street, New York, N. Y.
Eyerman & Co., 147 Hanford Street, Columbus, Ohio.
F K & Son, Inc., 15–17 Spencer Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
The Fairmont Provision Co., 735 South Willow Avenue, Alliance, Ohio.
Fairway Packing Corp., 216–218 Walton Street, Syracuse, N. Y.
Falk Bros., 511 Saint Joseph Street, Lancaster, Pa.
Herman Falter Packing Co., 378 Greenlawn Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.
Famous Foods, Inc., 1121 Pryor Street SW., Atlanta, Ga.
Famous Packing Corp., 122 Junius Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
The Fanestil Packing Co., Inc., Route 4, Emporia, Kans.
Farmer Pete Packing Co., 715 Santa Fe Drive, Denver, Colo.
Farnsworth Packing Co., 1487 Farnsworth, Detroit, Mich.
Farris & Co., 2116 West Beaver Street, Post Office Box 1553, Jacksonville, Fla.
Angelo Favazza, 1167 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
M. Feder & Co., 948 North Front Street, Allentown, Pa.
Federal Beef Co., 180 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass.
Federal Meat Co., 1614 Puyallup Avenue, Post Office Box 1113, Tacoma, Wash.
Federal Packing Co., Post Office Box 750, Everett, Wash.
Chas. J. Fehl Co., Blooming Glen, Pa.
Feinberg Kosher Sausage Co., 809–811 Lyndale Avenue North, Minneapolis, Minn.
Feldman Bros., 2472 Riopelle Street, Detroit, Mich.
Feller Packing Co., Rural Free Delivery 2, Clearfield, Utah.
F. A. Ferris & Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Ferry Bros., Inc., Ferndale, Wash.
Fidel Bros. Packing Co., Unionvile, Ohio.
Field Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 493, Owensboro, Ky.
Fiesta Meat Co., 3533 Evans Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Figge & Hutwelker Co., 621–635 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
Filler Products, Inc., 715 Highland Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
Fineberg Packing Co., 2875 Starling, Memphis, Tenn.
The Fink & Heine Co., Bechtle Avenue and D T & I R R, Springfield, Ohio.
C. Finkbeiner Inc., 900 High Street, Little Rock, Ark.
Fischer Packing Co., Box 182, Issaquah, Wash.
Henry Fischer Packing Co., Inc., 1860 Mellwood Avenue, Louisville, Ky.
Fischer & Fischer, 117 Washington Street West, Charleston W. Va.
E. L. Fisher, Post Office Box 506, Baytown, Tex.
Fisher Bros., 71 South Pearl Street, Bridgeton, N. J.
Flanery Sausage Co., Milbank, S. Dak.
Flechtner Bros. Packing Co., Inc., 435 North Countyline Street, Fostoria, Ohio.
Fleischaker Co., 1911 Frankfort Avenue, Louisville, Ky.
Philip Fleischer, Inc., 777 Washington Street, New York, N. Y.
L. W. & C. W. Fletcher, Inc., Lenoir City, Tenn.
Fletcher Wholesale Meats, 628 North Minnesota Street, Pratt, Kans.
Earl Flick Dressed Beef, Clackamas, Oreg.
Flicker Packing Co., South 12th Avenue, Scottsbluff, Nebr.
Fred W. Flockerzi, 14 Chestnut Street, Lawrence, Mass.
Florence Packing Co., Inc., Route 1, East Stanwood, Wash.
Florida Chip Steak Co., Inc., 4410 West South Street, Tampa, Fla.
Fluffs, Inc., 2005 Wall Street, Dallas, Tex.
Fluke, Inc., Cleveland Road, Ashland, Ohio.
The William Focke's Sons Co., 1712 Springfield Street, Dayton, Ohio.
Finley Packing Plant, McConnelsville, Ohio.
The Finest Provisions Company of Springfield, 190 Chestnut Street, Springfield, Mass.
Foell Packing Co., 3117–23 West 47th Street, Chicago, Ill.
Jacob Folger Packing Co., 500 Phillips Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
Foo Lung Co., 112 East Washington Street, Stockton, Calif.
Ford Packing Co., Grand Island, Nebr.
Foremost Packing Co., 1164 13th Avenue, East Moline, Ill.
Formost Kosher Sausage Co., 517 South 4th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Forst Packing Co., Inc., 100–144 Abeel Street, Kingston, N. Y.
Fort Bend Co. Abattoir, Box 385, Rosenberg, Tex.
Fort Dodge Packing Co., Inc., Box 488, Fort Dodge, Iowa.
Fort Plain Packing Co., 201 Main Street, Fort Plain, N. Y.
Fort Scott Packing Co., 1005 Shute Street, Fort Scott, Kans.
Foster Beef Co., 409 Elm Street, Manchester, N. H.
B. V. Fox Wholesale Meats, 4821 Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
J. Austin Fraley, Thurmont, Md.
Frank & Schrader, R. F. D. 3, Cuba, N. Y.
Frankel Meat Co., Union Stock Yards, Cincinnati, O.
Franklin Provision Co., 222 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Franza, 901 West Travis, San Antonio, Tex.
Fraser Wholesale Meats, 6 E Street NE., Ardmore, Okla.
Frederick County Products, Inc., Post Office Box 218, Frederick, Md.
Frederick Meat Co., East Balsom, Frederick, Okla.
Frederick Packing Co., 5300 Riopelle Street, Detroit, Mich.
Freeburg Packing Co., Freeburg, Ill.
Freeman Bros. Packing Co., 4905 Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
French Bros. Beef Co., Inc., Hooksett, N. H.
French Steak Co., 1285 Main Street, Swoyerville, Pa.
I. A. Frey & Sons, Inc., 3925 Burgundy Street, New Orleans, La.
Fried & Reinman Packing Co., 2100 East Ohio Street, Box 6769, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Morris Friedman, 2917 N. E. Stanton Street, Portland, Oreg.
Friedman & Belack, Inc., 634 Washington Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Frigid Packing Co., 144 Black Horse Pike, West Collingswood Heights, N. J.
Frigidinners, Inc., 1933–35 Reed Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Frigidmeats, Inc., 3755 S. Racine, Chicago, Ill.
Frisco Packing Co., 544 S. Walnut Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Frontier Packing Co., Post Office Box 922, Broadway SE., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Frosty Morn Meats, Frosty Morn Avenue, Post Office Box 391, Clarksville, Tenn.
Frosty Morn Meats, Inc., 1498 Furnace Street, Montgomery, Ala.
Frozen Meat Packers, Inc., 845 N. W. 71st Street, Miami, Fla.
Fryer & Stillman, Inc., 53d & Franklin, Denver, Colo.
Fulton Beef and Provision Co., 511 Newark Street, Hoboken, N. J.
Furr's, Inc., Box 838, Lubbock, Tex.
G. & C. Packing Co., 240 South 21st Street, Colorado Springs, Colo.
Eugene Gaboury, Jr., R. F. D. 2, St. Albans, Vt.
Galat Packing Co., 1472 Kenmore Boulevard, Akron, Ohio.
Galligan Meat Co., 1220 35th Street, Denver, Colo.
S. W. Gall's Sons, 2119–2125 Freeman Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Gambord Meat Co., Post Office Box 697, San Jose, Calif.
Garos Packing Co., Hooksett, N. H.
Gartner-Harf Co., 25 East 12th Street, Erie, Pa.
W. A. Gay & Co., Iowa City, Iowa.
Gebhardt Chili Powder Co., 112 South Frio Street, San Antonio, Tex.
Isaac Gellis, Inc., 37 Essex Street, New York, N. Y.
Albert Gemmen, Box 57, Allendale, Mich.
Genoa Packing Co., 221 Monsignor O'Brien Highway, East Cambridge, Mass.
Gentner Packing Co., Inc., West Roosevelt Road, South Bend, Ind.
Gerber Products Co., 460 Buffalo Road, Rochester, N. Y.
Gerber Products Co., Fremont, Mich.
George C. Gerber, Road 1, Dalton, Ohio.
Max German, 3836 Aldine Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Gerstenslager Meats, Inc., 336 North Market Street, Wooster, Ohio.
Gerson Packing Co., 2535 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Giant Distributing Co., 913 West Street, Oakland, Calif.
Earl C. Gibbs, Inc., 3378 West 65th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
John A. Gibbs, Bradford, Vt.
James B. Gilbert, 1110 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
K. C. Giles Co., 3183 West 65th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Gino Corp., Boston Post Road, Milford, Conn.
Girard Packing Co., 10–18 North Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Gissell Packing Co., Inc., 1501 Jefferson Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
Giuliano's Spaghetti Sauce Co., Inc., 250 Valley Street, Providence, R. I.
Giunta & D'Agostino, 901 Christian Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Joseph L. Giunta & Sons, 927 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Glasers Provisions Co., Inc., 5036 South 26th Street, Omaha, Nebr.
Glick Brothers, Mt. Pleasant, Pa.
Globe Packing Co., 11200 Kewen Street, San Fernando, Calif.
Globe Products Co., 5300 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo.
Glover Packing Co., Box 6609, Roswell, N. Mex.
Goebel Packing Co., 93 Holt Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

Albert F. Goetze, Inc., Post Office Box 1017, Baltimore, Md.
M M Goff & Sons Co., Inc., 118 West State Street, Pendleton, Ind.
Gold Medal Packing Corp., 614 Broad, Utica, N. Y.
H. S. Golde Packing Co., Inc., 193 Fillmore Avenue, Tonawanda, N. Y.
Goldberg Bros., 111 North Harrison Street, Wilmington, Del.
Goldberg, Boyarsky & Steirn, 655 Riverside Avenue, Burlington, Vt.
Goldis & Cross, Inc., 325 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Goldring Packing Co., Inc., 3461 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Gold Merit Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 4516, Jacksonville, Fla.
Gold Ribbon Fresh Frosted Meats, Inc., Post Office Box 112, Middletown, Pa.
H. Graver Co., 3813 Morgan Street, Chicago, Ill.
Angelo Grasso, 318 Meadow Street, Agawam, Mass.
A. Golin Wholesale Meats, 400 Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Gooch Packing Co., Eighth and Almond Streets, Abilene, Tex.
M. Goodman Sons, 2712 Blodgett Street, Houston, Tex.
Goodnight County Sausage, Route 3, Lubbock, Tex.
Jack Goose & Co., 3219 Michigan Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Goren Packing Co., Inc., 39 Commercial Street, Boston, Mass.
Goshen Packing Co., R. D. No. 1, Middletown, N. Y.
Daniel A. Gottlieb & Son., Inc., 416 Mount Vernon Street, Camden, N. J.
James P. Gourley, R. D. No. 1, New Bethlehem, Pa.
Grade A Meat Co., 1005 Washington Avenue, Houston, Tex.
Grady Packing Co., Inc., Cairo, Ga.
Grandview Packing Co., Grandview, Wash.
Granite Meat & Livestock Co., 500 East 56th Street South, Murray, Utah.
Granite State Packing Co., 163 Hancock, Manchester, N. H.
R. D. Graves Co., Westwood Drive, Strongsville, Ohio.
Graves Sausage Co., Route 1, Antioch, Tenn.
J. J. Gravins, Sixth Street Market, Richmond, Va.
Grays Harbor Meat Co., Inc., Foot of Washington Avenue, Hoquiam, Wash.
The Great Falls Meat Co., Post Office Box 1526, Great Falls, Mont.
Great Western Beef Co., 4044 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Great Western Packing Co., Inc., 3377 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Greater New York Packing, Inc., 525 11th Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Greater Omaha Packing Co., 5102 South 26th Street, Omaha, Nebr.
C. E. Greenawalt Sons, Mountville, Pa.
Greendell Packing Corp., Prattsville, N. Y.
Green Hill, Inc., United States Route 11, Elliston, Va.
Greenlee Packing Co., Inc., West Highway 16, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
The Greensboro Packing Co., Inc., Greensboro, Ala.
Greenville Packing Co., S. S. Norfolk S. R. R., Greenville, N. C.
Greenwood Packing Plant, Greenwood, S. C.
Greisler Bros., Inc., 230–232 North Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Sol Greisler & Sons, Inc., 32 North Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Gruensfelder Packing Co., 3914 North 25th Street, St. Louis, Mo.
David H. Griffith, Cushing, Okla.
Grote Meat Co., 4124 West Natural Bridge Road, St. Louis, Mo.
Arthur J. Guillot, Inc., 339 Charbonnet, Street, New Orleans, La.
Guillette & Co., 23 Blodgett Street (rear) Post Office Box 447, Manchester, N. H.
Gunsberg Beef Co., 6800 Dix Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Gustine Meat Co., Box 261, Gustine, Calif.
Gusto Ravioli Co., 653 Ninth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
P. D. Gwaltney, Jr. & Co., Inc., Smithfield, Va.
H. & H. Packing Co., Route 7, Yakima, Wash.
Chas. Haag, Inc., 497 Observer Highway, Hoboken, N. J.
Haas-Davis Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 277, Mobile, Ala.
Habbersett Bros., Media, Pa.
Philip H. Haha Co. & Specialty Meat Products, 179 Grafton Street, Worcester, Mass.
Edward Hahn Packing Co., Hickory Street & B. & O. R. R., Johnstown, Pa.
Haibach Bros., 501 East 19th Street, Erie, Pa.
Haldas Bros., Inc., 501–507 King Street, Wilmington, Del.
Haley Canning Co., 560 South Fourth Avenue, Hillsboro, Oreg.
Hall Bros., Inc., Cook Road, North Olmsted, Ohio.
Halpern Packing Corp., 88 Worchester Road, Framingham, Mass.
Halstead Packing Co., Fairview, Okla.
Halsted Packing House, 736 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Hammer Provision Co., 300 Rivos Street, San Antonio, Tex.
Hammond, Standish & Co., 2101 Twentieth Street, Detroit, Mich.
Hampden Beef Co., Inc., 203 Liberty Street, Springfield, Mass.
Hampshire Cash Market, Hampshire, Ill.
George Hanas, R. S. 1, Route 481, Daisytown, Pa.
H. A. Hancock, Acree, Ga.
Handschumacher & Co., Inc., 48 North Street, Boston, Mass.
Edward Hans, 38 Holt Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Harding Packing Co., Inc., 1450 Troy Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.
John P. Harding Market Co., 728 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
Hark Beef Co., 24 North Street, Boston, Mass.
Harkel Wholesale Meats, 3451 Frankford Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
W. I. Harman & Son, Saluda, S. C.
Harman Packing Co., 3305 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Trae V. Harper, 9th West 6th North, Brigham City, Utah.
Joel E. Harrell & Son, Inc., Post Office Box 115, Suffolk, Va.
Harris Meat & Produce Co., 1 North Western, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Sam Harris Packing Co., 802 Covington Street, Crawfordsville, Ind.
Hartford Provision Co., Inc., 302 Pleasant Street, Hartford, Conn.
Hartman's, R. D. No. 3, Nazareth, Pa.
Harvin Packing Co., Inc., Green Swamp Road, Sumter, S. C.
Hately Brothers Co., 1341 West 37th Street, Chicago, Ill.
Hatfield Packing Co., Hatfield, Pa.
Sam Hausman, Alameda & Mussett, Corpus Christi, Tex.
Hawley Meat Pack, Vale, Oreg.
G. E. Hawthorn, Route 2, Hot Springs, Ark.
Bert Hazekamp & Sons, 954 Evanston, Muskegon, Mich.
The Hebrew National Kosher Sausage Co., Inc., 155 East Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Hebron Packing Co., Inc., Route 173, Box 486, Hebron, Ill.
Bernard Hecht & Sons, Inc., 17 South Front Street, Baltimore, Md.
Philip Hedderel, 4112 Clematis Street, New Orleans, La.
Heierding Bros., 35 Harrison Avenue, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Henry Heil, 3624 Falls Road, Baltimore, Md.
Heil Packing Co., 2216 La Salle Street, St. Louis, Mo.
H. Heilbrunn Co., 501 Newark Street, Hoboken, N. J.
Heim Bros. Wholesale Meat Co., 1707 West 11th Street, Little Rock, Ark.
Heim & Thompson Packing Co., 4905 Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
H. T. Heinz, Inc., 135 South Warwick Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Heinz's Riverside Abattoir, Inc., 1900–22 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
Henderson's Portion Pak, Inc., 4015 Laguna Street, Coral Gables, Fla.
J. Henriques & Son, 113 Gano Street, Providence, R. I.
James Henry Packing Co., 2025 Airport Way, Seattle, Wash.
Mark Herbst, Inc., 222 Frelinghuysen Avenue, Newark, N. J.
Herman Sausage Co., Inc., Post Office Box 1651, Tampa, Fla.
C. Herrmann & Sons, 2640 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio.
Herrod Packing Co., Joplin, Mo.
Hersch Packing Co., South Avenue B, Box 962, Scottsbluff, Nebr.
C. Hertel Co., 220 Raphael Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.
Hervitz Packing Co., 1146 South Cameron, Harrisburg, Pa.
Heublein, Inc., 330 New Park Avenue, Hartford, Conn.
Ed Heuck Co., 530 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Hickory Packing Co., Inc., Box 653, Hickory, N. C.
High Grade Packing Co., Inc., 2627 Avenue D, Galveston, Tex.
John Hilberg & Sons Co., 525 Poplar Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
H. G. Hill Co., 500 2d Avenue North, Nashville, Tenn.
Hill-N-Dale Farm Meat Co., Post Office Box 61, Downingtown, Pa.
Hill Packing Co., Post Office Box 117, Esterville, Iowa.
Hill Packing Co., Post Office Box 148, Topeka, Kans.
Hill Top Packing Co., Rural Route 1, Huntingburg, Ind.
Hilleman's Packing Plant, 813 Union Street, Marshalltown, Iowa.
Hines Packing Co., 5213 South 50th Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.
Samuel W. Hippey, R. F. D. No. 1, Willow Street, Pa.
Hirsch Brothers & Co. (Inc.), 14th and Cedar Streets, Louisville, Ky.
Hitch Packing Co., Princeton, Ind.
Phil J. Hock & Co., 2123 Ailanthus Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Hodge Chile Co., 2310 Sidney Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Hoerter & Son, 2011 Frankfort Avenue, Louisville, Ky.
Hoffman Bros. Packing Co., Inc., 2731 South Soto Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
George Hoffman Packing Co., 4702 South 27th Street, Omaha, Nebr.
Roy L. Hoffman & Son, Route 4, Hagerstown, Md.
Hogansville Food Packers, Post Office Box 173, Hogansville, Ga.
E. V. Hohener, 2500 Davis Street, San Leandro, Calif.
Holiday Frosted Food Co., 150 Laurel Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Holland Supply Co., Holland, Va.
Grover D. Holland, 5305 Summit Avenue, Fort Smith, Ark.
Charles Hollenbach, Inc., 2653 Ogden Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
G. Hollenbach, 1100 West Marquette Road, Chicago, Ill.
J. Lloyd Hollinger, 814 Sixth Street, Lancaster, Pa.
Hollinger Meat Products, Inc., Post Office Box 86, Mechanicsburg, Pa.
Hollstein's Packing Co., Rushville, Nebr.
Holly Meat Packing Co., 2736 Magnolia Street, Oakland, Calif.
Walter Holm & Co., 827 Grand Avenue, Nogales, Ariz.

Holt Packing Co., Holt, Mich.
P. E. Holz Sons Co., Box 2666, Charleston, W. Va.
Home Packing Co., First and Chestnut Streets, Terre Haute, Ind.
The Home Packing Co., Lagrange Street, Toledo, Ohio.
Homestead Prov. & Packing Co., 321 Baldwin Street, Hays, Pa.
Hoosier Veterinary Laboratories, Inc., Thorntown, Ind.
Hopfman Bros. Inc., 525 Water Street, Clinton, Mass.
Hopkins Packing Co., Blackfoot, Idaho.
Hopkinson and Haigh, 857 East Russell Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
H. C. Hoppe Co., Box 36, Oakwood, Wis.
Everett C. Horlein & Son, 669 Howard Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
George A. Hormel & Co., Austin, Minn.
Joe Horovitz, c/o Dixon Packing Co., Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
L. P. Horst, Jr., Route 89, Harrisburg, Pa.
Geo. V. Hoskings Meat Packer, 2501 Cleveland Avenue, National City, Calif.
E. B. Hostoffer, Mount Pleasant, Pa.
Hot Shoppes, Inc., 1234 Upshur Street NW., Washington, D. C.
Houlton Packing Co., Inc., Route 2, Abilene, Kans.
House of Costa, Peaks Island, Portland, Maine.
Houston Packing Co., 3301 Navigation Boulevard, Houston, Tex.
Hubbard Packing Co., 1343 Hubbard Street, Chicago, Ill.
Hubbell & Sons Packing Co., 114 Milam Street, Houston, Tex.
Hudson Packing Co., Inc., 95 Central Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.
H. M. Huffman, Route 1, Vandergrift, Pa.
Hughes Packing Co., R. F. D. 1, Oberlin, Ohio.
Hughes Sausage Co., Post Office Box 70, North Little Rock, Ark.
Huler Beef Co., 4070 Deming Street, Detroit, Mich.
The Hull & Dillon Packing Co., West 4th Street, Pittsburg, Kans.
Humphrey-Mace Meat Co., North First Street, Dixon, Calif.
The Humko Co., 1702 North Thomas Street, Memphis, Tenn.
Chas. J. Hunn, 238 East Main Street, Chillicothe, Ohio.
Hunt Potato Chip Co., 70 Lake Avenue, Worcester, Mass.
Hunter Packing Co., Post Office Box 231, East St. Louis, Ill.
Huntington Packing Co., Inc., Box 322, Huntington, Ind.
H. Hurwitz, 328 Waverly Avenue, Newton, Mass.
Hygrade Food Products Corp., 2811 Michigan Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Hy-Grade Meat Specialties Co., 4990 Jackson Street, Denver, Colo.
Hy-Mark Kosher Meat Products Corp., 968 Longfellow Avenue, Bronx, New York.
Hynes Packing Co., 16400 S. Downey Avenue, Paramount, Calif.
Idaho Meat Packers Inc., Caldwell, Idaho.
Idaho Packing Co., Box 549, Twin Falls, Idaho.
Ideal Packing Co., Inc., 3095 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angles, Calif.
Illinois Meat Co., 3939 Wallace St., Chicago, Ill.
Illinois Packing Co., 911–993 West 37th Place, Chicago, Ill.
Imhof Packing Co., Inc., 227 Washington Street, New York, N. Y.
Independent Dressed Beef Co., Post Office Box 1166, Morgantown, W. Va.
Independent Meat Co., Inc., Post Office Box 430, Twin Falls, Idaho.
Inland Products, Inc., Box 926, Columbus, Ohio.
International Food Products Co., 4705 South Christiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Interstate Beef Co., 4 Commercial Street, Boston, Mass.
Iowa Beef Co., Inc., 75 South Market Street, Boston, Mass.
Irish & McBroom Packing Co., 300 Coburg Road, Eugene, Oreg.
J. & A. Meat Sales, 1200 Roosevelt Street, Stony Creek, Pa.
Jackson Packing Co., 2520 South Gallatin Street, Jackson, Miss.
Jackson Packing Co., Rosedale Avenue and G. M. & Co., Railroad, Jackson, Tenn.
Jackson Packing Co., Inc., Marianna, Fla.
Jacobs Packing Co., 1416 Adams Street, Nashville, Tenn.
John Jacobsmuhlen, Route No. 2, Box 125, Cornelius, Oreg.
M. Jacobson & Sons Co., Inc., 218 Southbridge Street, Auburn, Mass.
Janert Bros. Wholesale Meats, 1000 West Raymond Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Jefferson Packing Co., 500 Observer Highway, Hoboken, N. J.
Jiffy Steak Co., 1497–1499 Third Avenue, Freedom, Pa.
Johann Packing Co., 17170 Mitchell Street, Detroit, Mich.
Carl R. Johnson Wholesale Meats, 4115 South Westnedge Avenue, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Howard Johnson's Inc., 97–13 218th Street, Queens Village, N. Y.
Howard Johnson Inc., of Florida, 6901 Northwest 26th Avenue, Miami, Fla.
J. G. Johnson, Inc., Arthur Avenue and Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Johnson Food Co., 201 Lee Street, Post Office Box 665, Colorado Springs, Colo.
Johnson Meat Products Co., Inc., Pocomoke City, Md.
Johnstown Packing Co., Johnstown, Pa.
Jones-Chambliss Co., Post Office Box 2399, Jacksonville, Fla.
The Jones Dairy Farm, Fort Atkinson, Wis.
Jones Packing Co., Box 767, Dodge City, Kans.
Jones Packing Co., Second and Jackson Streets, Paducah, Ky.
Jones Sausage Co., R. F. D. 2, Danville, Va.
Jordan Meat & Livestock Co., 1225 West 33d South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Joseph Packing Co., Box 273, Connellsville, Pa.
Gus Juengling & Son, Inc., 2869 Massachusetts Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Juniata Packing Co., R. F. D. 2, Tyrone, Pa.
K & B Packing Co., 4800 Washington Street, Denver, Colo.
Kadish & Milman Beef Co., 138 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
The E. Kahn's Sons Co., 3241 Spring Grove Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
George Kaiser Packing Co., 81 North 1st Street, Kansas City, Kans.
Kansas City Chip Steak Co., 1121 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Mo.
Kansas City Dressed Beef Co., 77 South James Street, Kansas City, Kans.
Kansas Packing Co., 822 Greenwich Street, New York, N. Y.
Kansas Packing Co., 406 East 21st Street, Wichita, Kans.
I. Kaplan, 218 Hull Avenue, Olyphant, Pa.
Kappler Packing Co., 3356 Pontiac Road, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Fred Karg, Box 5636, Kenton Station, Portland, Oreg.
Wm. Karn & Sons, 922 Taylor Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.
W. F. Kastelberg & Co., 15 North 17th Street, Richmond, Va.
Kaufman Meat Co., 8th and Bayshore, San Jose, Calif.
Kaw Valley Packing Co., Inc., 17 South James Street, Kansas City, Kans.
Kay Packing Co., 17 North Louisiana, Houston, Tex.
Kearns Packing Co., 228 Wayne Street, Mansfield, Ohio.
Keck's Market, Second and Market, Richmond, Va.
H. H. Keim Co., Box 690, Nampa, Idaho.
Kelble Bros., Berlin Heights, Ohio.
Keller Bros., St. Helena, Calif.
Kelley Packing Co., 1089 Chehalis Avenue, Chehalis, Wash.
Thomas J. Kelly Beef Co., 30 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Kelly Foods Inc., Poplar Street, Jackson, Tenn.
Herman Kemper's Sons, Inc., 2124 Baymiller Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Kenmore Packing Co., Route 4, Box 294, Bothell, Wash.
Kenosha Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 509, Kenosha, Wis.
Kenton Packing Co., North Columbia Boulevard and Burrage, Post Office Box 5666, Kenton Station, Portland, Oreg.
Kerber Packing Co., Post Office Box 78, Elgin, Ill.
Lee G. Kern and Son, 580 Main Street, Slatington, Pa.
John Kern and Son, 251 Commercial Street, Portland, Maine.
Kern Valley Packing Co., Post Office Box 1229, Bakersfield, Calif.
Kesslers, 705 Hummel Avenue, Lemoyne, Pa.
Kilsheimer Bros., Inc., 1900 Bladensburg Road, NE., Washington, D. C.
King Steak Co., 3485 Janney Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Kingan and Co., Inc., Maryland and Blackford Streets, Indianapolis, Ind.
King's Food Products, Inc., 5255 North Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.
Kingston Beef Corp., 12–18 Meadow Street, Post Office Box 701, Kingston, N. Y.
T. F. Kinnealey and Co., Inc., 20 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Harvey A. Kipp, Rural Free Delivery 1, Bethlehem, Pa.
Alvin Kirsh, 1010 West Cary, Richmond, Va.
I. Klayman and Co., 876 North 48th Street., Philadelphia, Pa.
Mathew F. Klein Co., 1016 Napoleon, Detroit, Mich.
F. A. Klein Provision Co., Box 14, Turtle Creek, Pa.
Klinck Brothers, 588 Howard Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Klinck and Schaller Inc., 620 Babcock Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Klubnikin Packing Co., 3425 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Edw. J. Kluener, 12023 Bader Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Knauss Bros., Fulton Street, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
E. W. Knauss and Son, Quakertown, Pa.
E. W. Kneip, Inc., 911 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.
Knoxville Abattoir Co., North Central Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.
Knudson Packing Co., West Oneida Street, Preston, Idaho.
Koch Beef Co., Inc., 248 North Adams, Louisville, Ky.
A. Koch's Sons, 2900 Sidney Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. A. Kohl Packing Co., Inc., 1320 Ethan Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Chas. Koppenhaver, 556 North Second Street, Lykens, Pa.
Stanley Kornas, 4605 West 26th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
Korona Food Products, Inc., 2115–2117 Abbey Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Kosher Zion Sausage Co., 163–167 South Water Market, Chicago, Ill.
Kosh-R-Best, Inc., 620 Albany Avenue, Hartford, Conn.
Krall's Meat Market, Lebanon County, Schaeferstown, Pa.
Kramer Beef Co., 240 River St., Scranton, Pa.
J. Fred Kraus Sons, 2510 Dulany Street, Baltimore, Md.
Kreinberg and Krasny Inc., 3300 West 65th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Krey Packing Co., 2100 Bremen Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

Kriel Packing Co., Inc., 137 South Warwick Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Kummer Meat Co., Route 4, Hillsboro, Oreg.
Kunkel Packing & Provision Co., 2007 Broadway, Quincy, Ill.
Kunzler & Co., Inc., 648 Manor Street, Lancaster, Pa.
Kwiatkowski Bros., 144 Detroit Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Kwick Steak Co., Fairburn, Ga.
N. Lachapelle & Sons, 8-10 Charles Street, Worcester, Mass.
LaChoy Food Products, Division of Beatrice Foods Co., Archbold, Ohio.
Lackawanna Beef & Provision Co., 1000–1006 South Wyoming Avenue, Scranton, Pa.
Lakeside Products Co., Walled Lake, Mich.
Lakeview Farm Meat Market, Inc., 2002 Fourth Street NE. (mail) 1511 Good Hope Road SE., Washington, D. C.
Lamoni Packing Co., Inc., Lamoni, Iowa.
Lampe Market Company, 1950 Dakota Avenue, South, Huron, S. Dak.
Lampert Beef Co., Inc., 69 South Market Street, Boston, Mass.
Landers & Co., Post Office Box 6642, Stockyard Station, Denver, Colo.
Landy Packing Co., Box 251, St. Cloud, Minn.
M. Lapin & Sons Co., 316–330 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Isadore Lapine, 46 Kenilworth Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
V. LaRosa & Sons, Inc., Jacksonville Road and County Line, Hatboro, Pa.
Larson Brothers Co., Inc., 226–228 North James, Kansas City, Kans.
Guy A. Laurents Packing Co., 2700 Dwenger Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.
Lawrence Corp., 527 West 41st Street, Chicago, Ill.
Lawton Meat Supply, East End of "D" Street, Box 1187, Lawton, Okla.
H. W. Lay & Co., Inc., 4520 Peachtree Industrial Boulevard, Chamblee, Ga.
T. L. Lay Packing Co., 400–402 East Jackson Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.
C. W. Layer & Co., 1516 Story Avenue, Louisville, Ky.
Leduc Packing Co., Post Office Box 327, Springfield, Mo.
D. L. Lee & Sons, Alma, Ga.
Lee Foods, Inc., 137 Franklin Avenue, Scranton, Pa.
John J. Leech, 154 Cross Street Market, Baltimore, Md.
Leeds Packing Co., Inc., Leeds, Ala.
Olin M. Leidy, R. D. 1, Souderton, Pa.
Lem's Caterers, 125 Sisson Street, Pawtucket, R. I.
Leon's Famous Pit Bar B-Q, 101 North Ewing Avenue, Dallas, Tex.
Lester Packing Co., Linton, Ind.
Levin Dressed Beef Co., Inc., 816 Noble Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Abraham Levine, 9 Center Street, Ellenville, N. Y.
Levy Brothers, Post Office Box 41, Augusta, S. C.
Joe Lewis & Sons Kosher Meat Market, 1914 Hamilton Street, Houston, Tex.
Lewis & McDermott, Second and Harrison Streets, Berkeley, Calif.
Lewis River Meat Co., Route 1, Box 214, Woodland, Wash.
Libby-McNeill-Libby, Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
John Liber, Route 3, Alliance, Ohio.
Liberty Meat Packers, Route 1, Eagle, Idaho
Liberty Packing Co., 800 East Las Vegas Street, Colorado Springs, Colo.
Robert Lieberman, 404 West 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
Liebman Packing Co., Box 7, Green Bay, Wis.
E. C. Lightle, 2071 Payne Street, Columbus, Ohio.
The Lima Packing Co., 215 South Central Avenue, Lima, Ohio.
Lincoln Beef Co., 137 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Lincoln Meat Co., 3800 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Lindner Packing & Provision Co., 1624–30 Market Street, Denver, Colo.
Lingo Packing Co., Route No. 1, Jonesboro, Tenn.
Lipoff's Wholesale Meats, 828–830 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lisbon Sausage Co., 433 South Second Street, New Bedford, Mass.
Little Mexico Frozen Foods, South Chadbourne Street, San Angelo, Tex.
Little Rock Packing Co., Foot East 4th Street, Little Rock, Ark.
Little's Wholesale Meat House, 214 East Middle Street, Hanover, Pa.
Litvak Meat Co., 5900 York Street, Denver, Colo.
Lloyd Packing Co., 1038 North Canfield-Niles Road, Youngstown, Ohio.
George J. Lochmann Packing Co., Fort Dodge Route, Dodge City, Kans.
S. Loewenstein and Son, 1945 Adelaide Street, Detroit, Mich.
S. S. Logan & Son, Inc., 1935 Third Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
The Lohrey Packing Co., 2827–2829 Massachusetts Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Lombardi Brothers Wholesale Meats, 1926 West Elk Place, Denver, Colo.
Lone Star Packing Co., 812 Live Oak Street, Houston, Tex.
The Long Dressed Beef Co., West 68th Street and Big Four R. R., Cleveland, Ohio.
Longino & Collins, Inc., 3625 Tulane, New Orleans, La.
Longview Meat Co., Post Office 776, Longview, Wash.
Los Banos Abattoir, Post Office Box 949, Los Banos, Calif.
Los Hispanos Provision Co., Inc., 528 Craven Street, Bronx, N. Y.
Louisville Beef Co., 210 Adams Street, Louisville, Ky.
Louisville Provision Co., 914–920 East Market Street, Louisville, Ky.
Loup Valley Packing Co., Loup City, Nebr.
Loveland Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 178, Loveland, Colo.
Lovitt Beef Co., Inc., 315 Canal Street, Providence, R. I.
Lowrey's Freshies, Inc., 208 South Kalamath Street, Denver, Colo.
Loyal Packing Co., 3313–27 West 47th Street, Chicago, Ill.
Luce & Co., 300 Kansas Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Luck Bros. Co-op Packing Co., 425 North Second Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
M. Luck, Inc., 2345 North 18th Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Luedke Brothers, Inc., 2601 North 15th, Sheboygan, Wis.
Luer Bros. Packing & Ice Co., 725 East Broadway, Alton, Ill.
Luer Packing Co., Inc., 3026 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Lugbill Bros., Inc., Archbold, Ohio.
Peter J. Luger & Sons, Inc., First Avenue, Geneva Hill, Beaver Falls, Pa.
Lukon Meats, R. D. 3, Burgettstown, Pa.
Lu-Tex Packing Co., Inc., Box 688, Luling, Tex.
Luther's Locker & Packing Co., 409 Grant Street, Holdrege, Nebr.
Lutz Packing Co., 3205 South Rural Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Lykes Bros., Inc., Post Office Box 1690, Tampa, Fla.
Lykes Bros., Inc., of Georgia, Sylvester Road, Albany, Ga.
M. & C. Foods, Inc., 1820 North Major Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
M. & D. Provision Co., 1120 West 47th Place, Chicago, Ill.
MFA Packing Division, East Mill Street Road, Springfield, Mo.
M. & M. Packing Co., Iola, Kans.
Maass-Hartman Co., 621 West Ray Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
M. M. Mades Co., Inc., 67 South Street, Somerville, Mass.
Madison Beef Co., 8 North Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Madison Packing Co., 12th and Greenwood Streets, Madison, Ill.
Macarthur Packing Co., 4th and Halstead Street, Hutchinson, Kans.
MacKimm Bros., Inc., 3727 South Falsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Mahon-Bonenberger Packing Co., 2761 North Kentucky Avenue, Evansville, Ind.
Maier Bros., 497 Harmon Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.
Maierson Wholesale Meat, 621 West Ray Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Makpie Co., 1724 First Street, San Fernando, Calif.
Joseph Malecki, 191 Person Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
H. E. Malone, Route 1, Box 755, Texarkana, Ark.
Mandarin Food Products, Inc., 748 Ceres Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Manger Packing Corp., 124 South Franklintown Road, Baltimore, Md.
Manieri, Inc., 30th and Oxford Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. B. Manning & Son, 9531 East Beverly Boulevard, Pico, Calif.
Manning Dressed Beef, 2601 North Summit, Springfield, Mo.
H. Mapelli & Son, 1525 Blake Street, Denver, Colo.
Mar Meat Co., 900 Branch Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Marhoefer Packing Co. of Iowa, Postville, Iowa.
Marhoefer Packing Co., Inc., North Elm and 13th Streets, Muncie, Ind.
Maricopa Packing Co., Box 449, Phoenix, Ariz.
Market Cooperative Packing Co., Inc., 4445 South Soto Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
W. S. Marks, Route 2, Box 260, Woodland, Calif.
Marks & Sons, 3325 West 65th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Marlo Packing Corp., 1955 Carroll Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Marquette Provision Co., 5035 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Marshall Packing Co., Union and Swayzee, Marshalltown, Iowa.
Ezra W. Martin Co., P. O. Box 788, Lancaster, Pa.
J. Martinec Packing Co., P. O. Box 1234, Scotia, N. Y.
Marvel Meats Inc., 97 East Main Street, Corfu, N. Y.
Maryland Beef and Provision Co., 2139 Kirk Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Marysville Meat Packing Co., P. O. Box 8, Marysville, Calif.
Maryville Packing Co., 909 East Seventh, Maryville, Mo.
Massachusetts Packing Co., Inc., 133 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Master Meat Co., Inc., 310 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
J. H. Matthews & Son, P. O. Box 54, Sardinia, Ohio.
Maurer-Neuer Corp., 100 Meyer Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
Oscar Mayer & Co., Inc., 1241–1263 Sedgwick Street, Chicago, Ill.
Oscar Mayer Packing Co., 1335 West Second Street, Davenport, Iowa.
The Mayer Meat Co., 1031 Central, Middletown, Ohio.
Mays Brothers, Rural Route No. 6, Greeneville, Tenn.
R. E. Maynard Wholesale Meats, 3350 Griswold Road, P. O. Box 58, Port Huron, Mich.
McCabe Packing Plant, Route 29 West, Taylorville, Ill.
McCandless Packing Co., 334 Rhode Island Street, Memphis, Tenn.
C. A. McCarthy, Inc., 44 North Street, Boston, Mass.
McCook Packing Corp., P. O. Box 960, McCook, Neb.
McCook & Gray Packing Co., 406 Washington Avenue, Houston, Tex.

Sam McDaniel and Sons, Route 3, Bedford, Va.
Archie McFarland & Son, Inc., 2922 South Main Street, Post Office Box 1853, Salt Lake City, Utah.
John McKenzie Packing Co., Inc., 40 George Street, Burlington, Vt.
Joseph McSweeney & Sons, S. A. L. Railroad and Dineen Street, Richmond, Va.
Meats, Inc., 1200 Alaskan Way, Seattle, Wash.
Meca Meat Co., 2535 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Medford's, Inc., 18 West Second Street, Chester, Pa.
Medina Provision Co., Medina, N. Y.
Edward Meister, 84 South Franklintown Road, Baltimore, Md.
Melton Provision Co., 1717 South Brazos Street, San Antonio, Tex.
Memphis Butchers Association, Inc., 1186 Riverside Boulevard, Memphis, Tenn.
Morris Mendel & Co., Rural Delivery 1, Norwich, N. Y.
Menghini Bros., Inc., Box 226, Frontenac, Kans.
Menichetti Packing Co., North Clary Street, Petersburg, Ill.
Menner Packing Corp., 200 Rutgers Street, Maplewood, N. J.
Merkel, Inc., 9411 Sutphin Boulevard, Jamaica, N. Y.
Merkel & Nowmair, Inc., 8386 Main Street, Utica, Mich.
Meszaros Bros., Inc., 1079 South Broad Street, Trenton, N. J.
Metz Bros. Meats, 2860 Sidney Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
George H. Meyer Sons, 1601 Overbrook Road, Richmond, Va.
Henry Meyer's Sons, Inc., 2855 Sidney Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Meyer Packing Co., 3127 Cherokee, St. Louis, Mo.
Meyer's Packing Co., Chicago and Lafayette Streets, Sioux City, Iowa.
The H. H. Meyer Packing Co., Central Avenue and Linn Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
John Micelle, Lake Charles, La.
A. Michaud Co., 175 West Oxford Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Joe Michel Packing Co., Post Office Box 492, Meridian, Miss.
Mickelberry's Food Products Co., 801–811 West 49th Place, Chicago, Ill.
Mickelberry Sausage Co., 801 West 49th Place, Chicago, Ill.
Middle Georgia Abattoir, Inc., Post Office Box 104, Macon, Ga.
Middletown Packing Co., Inc., River Road and Asylum Street, Middletown, Conn.
Midland Empire Packing Co., Inc., Billings, Mont.
Mid-South Packers, Inc., Post Office Box 143, Tupelo, Miss.
Mid-State Packers, Inc., Post Office Box 427, Bartow, Fla.
Mid-State Packing Co., Inc., 25 Metcalf Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Midtown Veal and Mutton Co., Inc., 37 Legal Street, Newark, N. J.
Mid-West Packing Co., 1301 West Broadway, Sweetwater, Tex.
Midwest Packing Co., 4823 South 27th Street, Omaha, Nebr.
Mid West Packing Co., 1310 North Fifth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mid-Valley Beef Co., Inc., 218 Hull Avenue, Olyphant, Pa.
Louis Milani Foods, Inc., 4253 West 40th Street, Chicago, Ill.
Roy C. Miles, 106 South Main Street, Livingston, Mont.
Milikin Packing Co., 4350 South Alcoa Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Millar Bros. & Co., Southeast Corner 35th and Reed Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
Miller Abattoir Co., 2014 Fifth Street, North Bergen, N. J.
Miller Brothers, 918 Chestnut Street, Camden, N. J.
Miller & Hart, Inc., 46th Street and Packers Avenue, Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
Miller Packing Co., 15214 74th Street, South Seattle, Wash.
Miller Packing Co., 206 Second Street, Oakland, Calif.
Charles Miller & Co., North Bergen, N. J.
E. A. Miller & Sons, Hyrum, Utah.
Millers Meats, Star Route, Millersburg, Ohio.
Miller's Super Markets, Inc., 4120 Brighton Boulevard, Denver, Colo.
Theo T. Miloch & Son, 4070 Deming Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Milwaukee Dressed Beef Co., Inc., 126 North Muskego Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Milwaukee Meat & Provision, 2245 North Teutonia Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Minch's Wholesale Meats, Box 712, Red Bluff, Calif.
John Minder & Son, Inc., 75 Stockton Street, Newark, N. J.
Morris Mindick, 12 Intervale Street, Roxbury, Mass.
Min Sun Trading Co., 2222 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
Minute Steak Co., Box 21, Mitchell Avenue, Burlington, N. J.
The Miracle Ham Co., Inc., 700 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Mitchell Packing Co., Box 111, Mitchell, S. Dak.
Mlotok Beef Co., 5 Washington Street, Paterson, N. J.
Moberly Packing Co., Box 442, Moberly, Mo.
Modern Meat Packing Co., 3501 Emery Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
H Moffat & Co., 1400 Fairfax Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Mogen David Kosher Meat Products Corp., 968 Longfellow Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Mohawk Packing Co., 1660 Bayshore Highway, San Jose, Calif.
Mohr, Inc., Route 12, Box 214, Tacoma, Wash.
Emery M. Molnar, Latchie Road, Millbury, Ohio.
Monarch Meat Packing Co., 1323 North 6th Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Monarch Packing Co., 2496 Orleans, Detroit, Mich.
Monarch Packing Co., 3026 North Elliott Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Monarch Packing Co., Inc., 89 Margin Street, Salem, Mass.
Monarch Provision Co., 920 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.
Monroe Packing Co., 1801 Monroe Street, Gary, Ind.
Monroe Packing Co., Post Office Box 604, Monroe, Wash.
Monroe Packing Co., Inc., 400 Ferrano Street, Rochester, N. Y.
Montana Horse Products, Butte, Mont.
Montana Meat Co., Inc., 1419 Helena Avenue, Helena, Mont.
Montell, Inc., 105 Muir Street, Cambridge, Md.
Montenery Provisions, Connorsville, Ohio.
Montrose Beef Co., Inc., Coxton Road, Pittston, Pa.
Morgan Packing Co., Inc., Austin, Ind.
Morgan's Meat Market, 25 East Pattsville Street, Pine Grove, Pa.
Henry Morlang, Inc., U. S. Route 50, Parkersburg, W. Va.
John Morrell & Co., Inc., South Iowa Avenue, Ottumwa, Iowa.
John Morrell & Co., 3700 North Grove, Fort Worth, Tex.
Morrell-Felin Co., 4142 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Morris Packing Co., 666 Windsor Street, Hartford, Conn.
G. L. Morrison, 115 South 24th Street, Boise, Idaho.
Morrison & Schiff Corp., 64 Fulton Street, Boston, Mass.
Morrissey Meats and Provisions, 706 First Avenue North, Nashville, Tenn.
Morton Bros. Packing Co., Johnson City, Tenn.
Motor City Packing Co., 1532 Alfred Street, Detroit, Mich.
Mt. Angel Meat Co., Mount Angel, Oreg.
Mt. Sterling Packing Co., East High Street, Mount Sterling, Ky.
Mt. Vernon Meat Co., Route 1, Mount Vernon, Wash.
Mountain Packing Co., Box 286, Dolores, Colo.
Mountain Packing Corp., 162 Craven Street, Asheville, N. C.
Mouret Packing Co., 506 Garland Lane, Opelousas, La.
C. D. Moyer Co., Silverdale, Pa.
Mulberry Provision Co., Post Office Box 1294, Macon, Ga.
Harry E. Mundy & Son, R. D. 1, Bound Brook, N. J.
Munhall Packing Co., 805 Ravine Street, Munhall, Pa.
Munn & Co., 426 Third Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
Muntean Packing Co., 5238 Russell Street, Detroit, Mich.
Murphy's Boneless Beef, Lincoln and Weber Avenue, Stockton, Calif.
Murphy Meat Co., 1809 23d Street, Sacramento, Calif.
Murray Packing Co., Plainwell, Mich.
Murry's Steaks, Inc., 403 Swann Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
Mutual Beef & Veal Co., 120 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Wm. F. Myers Sons, Inc., Westminster, Md.
Herman Nacker & Co., 2916 West Forest Home Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Lawrence E. Nagel, Marissa, Ill.
Nagle Packing Co., 2963 Lansing Road, Lansing, Ill.
Nalley's, Inc., 3410 South Lawrence Street, Tacoma, Wash.
National Meat Packers, Inc., 517 West 24th Street, Post Office Box N, National City, Calif.
National Provision Co., 117 45th Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
National Tea Co., Fergus Falls, Minn.
Natural Bridge Packing Co., 4220–4222 Natural Bridge, St. Louis 15, Mo.
Nea Agora Packing Co., 953 West Lexington Street, Chicago 7, Ill.
D. E. Nebergall Meat Co., Post Office Box 188, Albany, Oreg.
Nebraska Beef Co., 36th and I Streets, Omaha 7, Nebr.
Ned Cloud Packing Co., 1511 South Kansas, Springfield, Mo.
Neese Sausage Co., Route 6, Greensboro, N. C.
Neff's Meat Market, Main Street, Yoe, Pa.
E. P. Nelson, 504 West Maywood Street, Peoria 5, Ill.
Frank A. Nelson, Route 2, Box 112, Ludington, Mich.
Nelson Meat Co., Post Office Box 152, Coyote, Calif.
Nenninger Packing Co., Cape Girardeau, Mo.
P. H. Ness, Route 2, York, Pa.
Neuhoff Bros., Packers, 2821 North Alamo, Dallas 1, Tex.
Neuhoff Packing Co. (Swift & Co.), 1307 Adams Street, Nashville, Tenn.
New Bedford Linguica Co., 56 Davis Street, New Bedford, Mass.
New Bern Provision Co., Highway 17, New Bern, N. C.
New Castle Packing Co., Post Office Box 416, County Line Road, New Castle, Pa.
New City Packing & Provision Co., 147 South Water Market, Chicago, Ill.
The New-Cooperative Co., Dillonvale, Ohio.
New England Provision Co., Inc., 960 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston 18, Mass.
New Hampshire Provision Co., Inc., 698 Islington Street, Portsmouth, N. H.
Newsom Packing Co., Mount Vernon, Tex.
Nichols-Foss Packing Co., 201 Morton Street, Bay City, Mich.

Niebergall & Martini, Inc., 4415 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va.
Edgar Nimmer, 2719 North 3d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
G. B. Nissen Packing Co., Inc., Webster City, Iowa.
Noble Packing Co., Inc., 816 Noble Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Noble's Independent Meat Co., Post Office Box 1020, Madera, Calif.
Nola Beef Co., Post Office Box 24, Arabi, La.
Normal Meat Co., 4021 South Normal Ave., Chicago, Ill.
North American Packing Co., 93–95 South Market Street, Boston, Mass.
North East Packing Co., 20 Water Street, Somerville, Mass.
North End Manufacturer, 364 Brightman Street, Fall River, Mass.
North End Provision Co., 544 North Underwood Street, Fall River, Mass.
North Platte Packing Co., 2400 East Eighth Street, North Platte, Nebr.
North River Meat Co., Inc., 449 West 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
North Side Packing Co., 2200 Spring Garden Avenue, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Northside Packing Co., 3100 Colerain Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Norwich Packing Co., 24 North Thames Street, Norwich, Conn.
Abe Novack, 20 Balmforth Avenue, Danbury, Conn.
E. F. O'Berry, Post Office Box 111, Suffolk, Va.
J. F. O'Neill Packing Co., 25th and Z Streets, Omaha, Nebr.
O. K. Packing Co., Goodland, Kans.
O. K. Packing Co., Tecumseh, Okla.
Oakland Meat Co., 3823 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Clarence Obermeyer, 1223–26 Bank Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Ocoma Foods Co., 810 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
Ogden Dressed Meat Co., Post Office Box 295, Ogden, Utah.
Ohio Packing Co., 3245 East Fifth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.
The Ohio Provision Co., 6101 Walworth Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Oklahoma City Packing Co., 1300 Southwest 15th Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Okmulgee Packing Co., 1500 West Fourth Street, Okmulgee, Okla.
Old Yankee Foods, 700 Fifth South, Seattle, Wash.
George Oldani & Co., 202 South Ninth Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Oldani Brothers Sausage Co., 2201 Edwards Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Old Smoky Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 112, Middletown, Pa.
Olesky Packing Co., Tallmadge, Ohio.
Omaha Dressed Beef Co., 4640 South 31st Street, Omaha, Nebr.
Omaha Packing Co., 71 Paris Street, Newark, N. J.
Omaha Packing Co., Inc., 120 South Market Street, Boston, Mass.
On-Cor Food Products, 1227 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.
Ontario Meat Packing Co., Ontario, Oreg.
Orange County Meat Co., 11666 East Bolsa Avenue, R. D. 3, Santa Ana, Calif.
Orange Co. Packing Co., Inc., Chester, N. Y.
Orleans Canning Co., Jamestown, N. Dak.
Orofino Mercantile Co., 209 Johnson Avenue, Orofino, Idaho.
Orvis & Clinger, Inc., 5000 East Fremont Street, Stockton, Calif.
Orvis Bros & Taylor, Post Office Box 41, Modesto, Calif.
Osborne Stock Farms, 8275 Central Avenue, NE., Minneapolis, Minn.
I. Oscherwitz & Sons, 659 West Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Osher Bros. Co., 1840 North Ridge Road, Elyria, Ohio.
Oswald & Hess Co., 1550 Spring Garden Avenue, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Otoe Food Products Co., Nebraska City, Nebr.
Ottman & Co., Inc., 2 Ninth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Owen Bros. Packing Co., Inc., U. S. Highway 11 South, Meridian, Miss.
Maurice Owsowitz & Son, 17–21 Newell Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
P & B Packers, Inc., 18th and Vine Streets, Hays, Kans.
P. D. & J. Meats, Box 392, Kent, Wash.
P. & H. Packing Co., 7036 Second Avenue, Dallas, Tex.
Pace Packing Co., Inc., 1300 West Broadway, Sweetwater, Tex.
Pacific Meats, Route 6, Box 740, Puyallup, Wash.
Pacific Meat Co., Inc., Kenton Station, Post Office Box 5636, Portland, Oreg.
Pahler Packing Corp., R. F. D. No. 1, Potsdam, N. Y.
Paige Meat Co., 4220 Natural Bridge, St. Louis, Mo.
Palmer Packing Co., Post Office Box 658, Candelario Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Palmyra Bologna Co., Inc., Palmyra, Pa.
Howard Pancero & Co., 256–260 Stark Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Panhandle Packing Co., Box 206, Alliance, Nebr.
Panhandle Packing Co., Inc., Pampa, Tex.
Paragon Food Products, Inc., 431 Somerville Street, Manchester, N. H.
Wm. C. Parke & Sons, 724 West 21st Street, Ogden, Utah.
Parker House Sausage Co., 4605 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.
Parker Sausage Co., De Garis Mill Road, Georgetown, Ky.
H. G. Parks, Inc., 2509 Pennsylvania Avenue (rear), Baltimore, Md.
Parks Sausage Co., 2460 Woodbrook Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Parks, Harris & Co., Columbia, Tenn.
Anthony Parillo, Inc., 1347 Hartford Avenue, Johnston, R. I.
Parrot Packing Co., Maumee Road, Fort Wayne, Ind.
Parsell Beef Co., 313 West Water Street, Flint, Mich.
Pasco Meat Products, Inc., 618 Howard Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Pashigan Brothers, 2816 18th Street, Detroit, Mich.
Urban N. Patman, Inc., 3290 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Pavetti Sausage Mfg. Co., 2261 North Linden Avenue, Trinidad, Colo.
Payne Sausage Co., Rural Route 6, Jonesboro, Tenn.
Pearl Packing Co., Inc., 710 North West Street, Madison, Ind.
Peck Meat Packing Corp., 2215 West Scott Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Peer Food Products Co., 1400 West 46th Street, Chicago, Ill.
Peerless Packing Co., 3290 West 65th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Peet Packing Co., Chesaning, Mich.
John M. Peluso, Rural Delivery Number 1, New Castle, Pa.
Penczek Bros., Room 214, Exchange Building, Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
Penford Packing Co., 127th Street and State Road, Lemont, Ill.
E. W. Penley, 37 Knight Street, Auburn, Maine.
Penn Beef Co., 215 West Norris Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Penn Packing Co., 630 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Peoples Market, Yerington, Nev.
People's Market, Roberts & Oelwein, Inc., Sixth and Center Street, Pocatello, Idaho.
People's Wholesale Market, Box 64, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
Pepper Packing Co., 901 East 46th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. Perlin, 444 Church Street, Norfolk, Va.
Perretta Packing Co., Brier Hill, N. Y.
Perth Amboy Packing Co., 605 New Brunswick Avenue, Perth Amboy, N. J.
Peschke Packing Co., 313 South Jackson Street, Ionia, Mich.
Wm. H. Peters, Inc., Seventh and Sayford Streets, Harrisburg, Pa.
Peters Meat Products, Inc., doing business as Claire Mont Packing Co., Wagner Street, Chippewa Falls, Wis.
Peters Packing Co., Post Office Box 1151 (4000 Peoria Road), Springfield, Ill.
Peters Sausage Co., 5454 West Vernor Highway, Detroit, Mich.
Peyton Packing Co., Inc., East End of 11th Street, Cotton Addition South, El Paso, Tex., Postoffice Box 106.
Peza's Slaughter House, 60 Armento Street, Johnston, R. I.
Pezzner Bros., 16 Cook Street, Ashley, Pa.
Pfaelzer Bros., Inc., 939 West Place, Chicago, Ill.
Philadelphia Boneless Beef Co., 223 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Philadelphia Dressed Beef Co., 114–128 Moore Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Phillips Packing Co., Race Street, Cambridge, Md.
Gibson Pierce, R. F. D. 3, Suffolk, Va.
Pierce Packing Co., Inc., Billings, Mont.
Bernard S. Pincus Co., 735 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Pinkney Packing Co., 2900 Third Street, Amarillo, Tex.
Pioneer Meat Packers, Box 492, Ontario, Oreg.
Pioneer Provision Co., 65 Brady Avenue NW., Atlanta, Ga.
Pipkin-Boyd-Neal Packing Co., Box 405, Joplin, Mo.
Piute Packing Co., Postoffice Box 1545, Bakersfield, Calif.
Pizza Frozen, Inc., 611 Tower Grove, St. Louis, Mo.
Plat Packing Co., 1410 Fifteenth Street, Denver, Colo.
Isadore Platt, 3108 Madison Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. Wilbur Plitt & Bros., 1900 Retreat Street, Baltimore, Md.
George E. Plitt, Inc., 2652 Pennsylvania Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Plymouth Rock Provision Co., Inc., 2700 Third Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Pocomoke Provision Co., Front Street, Pocomoke, Md.
S. Poehlman, 4512½ Ninth Street, Rock Island, Ill.
Polarized Meat Co., Postoffice Box 608, Scranton, Pa.
Poletti Sausage Co., 428 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
John Pollak Packing Co., Box 60, North Aurora, Ill.
Port Stockton Sausage Co., 1320 South Aurora Street, Stockton, Calif.
Pontius Meats, rear 14 East Pine Street, Selinsggrove, Pa.
Portland Provision Co., Postoffice Box 5666, Kenton Station, Portland, Oreg.
R. E. Poss and Son, R. F. D. 4, Box 493, Athens, Ga.
Potts Packing Co., 507 West Fourth Street, Okmulgee, Okla.
Powell Meat Co., West Bainbridge, Ga.
Pratt Packing Co., Magnolia Street, Sulphur Springs, Tex.
Prejean's Wholesale Meat and Products, Carencro, La.
Premier Packing Co., Inc., 1240 Columbus Avenue, Boston, Mass.
Premier Smoked Meats, Inc., 85 North Sixth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Premium Food Plan, Inc., 4563 Torresdale Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. J. Price, 1126 Engle Street, Chester, Pa.
Prickett Packing Co., Batesvile, Ark.
Pride of Lima Provision Co., 1304 Neubrecht Road, Box 567, Lima, Ohio.
Prim Packing Co., 217 Third Street, McDonald, Pa.

Prime Packing Co., 2049 North Fourteenth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Primeat Packing Co., 2380 20th Street, Detroit, Mich.
Prince-Roselli Foods, Inc., 6575 Chestnut Avenue, Merchantville, N. J.
The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., Richmond Terrace & Western Avenue, Port Ivory, Staten Island, N. Y.
Provisions Meat Co., 225 Webster Street, Oakland, Calif.
Pruden Packing Co., Post Office Box 14, Suffolk, Va.
Prudence Foods, Inc., 188 State Street, Boston, Mass.
Psichalinos Bros. & Co., Inc., 722 Blue Island Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Puckett Stock Farm, Sayre, Okla.
Punxsutawney Beef & Prov. Co., Punxsutawney, Pa.
Purdy Steak Co., 2730 East Layton Avenue, Cudahy, Wis.
Pureta Sausage Co., 324 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento, Calif.
Puritan Beef Co., Inc., 825 Washington Street, New York, N. Y.
Purity Packing Co., Powell Station, Tenn.
Quaker City Packing Co., Inc., 104 Union Street, Allentown, Pa.
The Quaker Oats Co., Merchandise Plaza, Room 345, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
Quaker State Foods Corp., 131 Dahlem Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Quality Meat Packing Co., 4512 South Alcoa Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Quality Packing Co., Post Office Box 1018, Lexington, Ky.
Quality Packing House, Inc., Route 1, New London, Wis.
Quality Packing Plant, South of Sugar Factory, Sterling, Colo.
Queen Packing Co., Inc., 324 North Randolph Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Queen Packing Corp., 900 Campbell Street, Rochester, N. Y.
R & C Packing Co., 4003 Dahlman Boulevard, Omaha, Nebr.
R & R Provision Co., 1240 Pine Street, Easton, Pa.
R & R Wholesale Veal & Beef, 1538 Wazee Street, Denver, Colo.
Raber Packing Co., Inc., 100 Apple Street, Peoria, Ill.
Wm. J. Rahe & Sons, East Jackson Street & Wilson Road, Muncie, Ind.
Earl Rainbow, Palmyra, N. Y.
Randolph Packing Co., Route 2, Randleman, N. C.
Randy's Frozen Meats, 7602 West 55th Street, Arvada, Colo.
Randy's Steaks, Centerville Road, Manassas, Va.
Rapides Packing Co., Inc., Box 806, Alexandria, La.
Raskin Packing Co., 1918 Jay Avenue, Sioux City, Iowa.
Rath Packing Co., Elm and Sycamore Streets, Waterloo, Iowa.
Raton Packing Co., 1216 Brilliant, Raton, N. Mex.
Frank Rausch & Son, Inc., 1097 William Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Rayner Packing Co., Inc., 3713 Jensen Drive, Houston, Tex.
Ray's Abattoir, Blackfoot, Idaho.
Ray's Brand Products, 1920 South 13th Street, Springfield, Ill.
Abramo Re, 52 Fulton Street, Boston, Mass.
Rea Serum Co., P. O. Box 471, Tallahassee, Fla.
E. S. Read, East Fairfield, Vt.
Clair E. Reader, 478 Adams Street, Rochester, Pa.
Real Kosher Sausage Co., Inc., 15 Rivington Street, New York, N. Y.
Redmond Packing Co., Inc., Box 626, Redmond, Oreg.
Reelfoot Packing Co., South 5th Street, Union City, Tenn.
Wm. G. Rehn's Sons, 450 Bank Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
George L. Reid, Inc., 1613–19 Retreat Street, Baltimore, Md.
M. Reinfeld & Sons, Inc., 98–100 Prince Street, Newark, N. J.
Reinhardt Packing Co., 2620 Elliott Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Reitz Meat Products Co., 5608 Raytown Road, Kansas City, Mo.
Reliable Packing Co., 1440 West 47th Street, Chicago, Ill.
Reliable Provision Co., 330–332 Miflin Avenue, Scranton, Pa.
Frank D. Rendulic, 800 Manning Avenue, McKeesport, Pa.
Reo Foods, Inc., 2925 Indianola Road, Des Moines, Iowa.
Republic Food Products Co., 47th and Christiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Rice Meat Packing Co., South 307 Conklin Road, Veradale, Wash.
C. Rice Packing Co., Patton Street and Eastern Avenue, Covington, Ky.
R. B. Rice Sausage Co., Inc., Route 3, Lee's Summit, Mo.
Joseph N. Rice Co., 1564 Water Street, Covington, Ky.
C. E. Richards & Sons., 213 West Second Street, Muscatine, Iowa.
H. Richberg & Son, 2806 Division Street, Manitowoc, Wis.
Richlor Boneless Pork, Inc., 2766 Webster Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Ridley Packing Co., Duncan, Okla.
Morris Rifkin & Sons, Inc., Union Stockyards, South Street, St. Paul, Minn.
Richter's Food Products, Inc., 1040 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.
Carl Rittberger, R. F. D. 6, Zanesville, Ohio.
Ritter's, 300 East Philadelphia Avenue, Boyertown, Pa.
The Rittman Packing Co., Inc., Rittman, Ohio.
Riverside Packing Co., 817 Water Street, Jackson, Mich.
Robb Packing Co., Post Office Box 496, Lisle Road, Lexington, Ky.
A. C. Roberts, Kimberton, Pa.
Roberts & Oake, Inc., 45th Street and Racine Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Roberts Packing Co., Kimberton, Pa.
Robertson Packing Co., 303 South Main, Springfield, Mo.
Robison & Terrell, Fillmore, Utah.
Rochester Independent Packer, 11 Independence Street, Rochester, N. Y.
Rochester Packing Co., Hacker Street, Rochester, Mich.
Rockford Wholesale Beef Co., Stillman Valley, Ill.
Rocky Mountain Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 1008, Casper, Wyo.
Roddey Packing Co., Inc., 707 Stadium Road, Columbia, S. C.
The J. H. Rodman Graff Corp., 309 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Roegelein Provision Co., 1700 South Brazos, San Antonio, Tex.
L. C. Rogers Sausage Co., Route 3, Harrodsburg, Ky.
Rogers Meat Products, 117 Summer Street, Fitchburg, Mass.
Rolet Food Products Co., Inc., 24 Bogart Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Roman Packing Co., Box 602, Norfolk, Nebr.
Roman Products Corp., 498 Huyler Street, South Hackensack, N. J.
Rome Provision Co., Inc., 105 Pollock Street, Rome, Ga.
Roode Packing Co., Fairbury, Nebr.
Max Rosenberg & Co., 300 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Eugene Rothmund, Inc., 21 South Street, Somerville, Mass.
Roos Packing Co., 2210 Kentucky Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.
Riverside Meat Co., 1614 Puyallup Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
Rose City Packing Co., Inc., West Broad Street, New Castle, Ind.
Sandy Rose Meat Market, 1033 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rose Packing Co., Inc., 2129 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
Rosebud Packing Co., Box 523, Winner, S. Dak.
Roselle Packing Co., 1201 East Linden Avenue, Linden, N. J.
Rosen Meat Packing Co., 3425 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rosenthal Packing Co., 2010 North Grove Street, Fort Worth, Tex.
Rosevale Packing Co., De Witt, Mich.
Roseville Packing Co., Route 1, Box 302, Springfield, Mo.
Robert E. Ross Abattoir, 2000 West Washington Street, Springfield, Ohio.
Wm. Roth, 886 Kirby Street, Columbus, Ohio.
Roth Packing Co., Inc., Glenwood, Iowa.
M. Rothschild & Sons, Inc., 1040 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.
John Roth & Sons, Inc., 42d and T Streets, Omaha, Nebr.
Rountree Packing Co., Hanover, Mich.
J. H. Routh Packing Co., South Campbell Street, Post Office Box 650, Sandusky, Ohio.
Routh Packing Co., 419 South Sandusky, Tiffin, Ohio.
A. Rowe Sons Co., First and Linden Streets, Terre Haute, Ind.
L. E. Rowland & Sons Co., 419 Findley Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Roy Meat, 1756 East 5600 South Street, Roy, Utah.
Royal Gorge Packing Co., Rhoades Avenue, Canon City, Colo.
Royal Meat Products Co., 707 Linwood, Kansas City, Mo.
Royal Packing Co., Post Office Box 1028, Broderick, Calif.
Royal Packing Co., Inc., 36½ Park Street, Lawrence, Mass.
Royal Packing Co., 1719 North Vandeventer Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Roy's Food Products, Inc., 2804 South Calumet Avenue, Chicago, Ill
Nathan Rubin, Inc., 2426 Scotten Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Rucci's Quality Meats, 2226 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ruchti Bros., 10600 Ruchti Road, South Gate, Calif.
E. J. Rudman & Co., 104 Union Street, Allentown, Pa.
John Ruddy Packing Co., Old Petrolia Road, Wichita Falls, Tex.
Rudy Sausage Co., 2607 McGavock Road, Nashville, Tenn.
Rudy's Quality Meats, Broad Street, Landisville, Pa.
Rund Packing Co., Inc., First and Ellsworth Streets, Lafayette, Ind.
George G. Ruppersberger & Sons, Inc., 2639–2645 Pennsylvania Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Russ Meat Co., Post Office Box 26, Eureka, Calif.
Russell Packing Co., 3946 Normal Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Russell Packing Co., Inc., Long Prairie, Minn.
Russell Provision Co., 2457 Russell Street, Detroit, Mich.
Russellville Packing House, Russellville, Ark.
Tony Russo, 951 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rutherford Food Corp., 4 West 13th Street, Kansas City 6, Mo.
Ryan Packing Co., Blue Run Road, Maysville, Ky.
Rygg Packing, Inc., East Stanwood, Wash.
S & S Packing Corp., 300 Johnson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
S & S Provision Co., 621 West Ray Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Sabrett Food Products Corp., 50 Colden Street, Jersey City, N. J.
Safeway Stores, Inc., Post Office Box 660, Fourth and Jackson Streets, Oakland, Calif.
Sahlen Packing Co., Inc., 318 Howard Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

St. Clair Foods Co., Ltd., Lozano Street, San Juan, Tex.
St. Cloud Meat Packing Co., 14th Street and Third Avenue South, St. Cloud, Minn.
Eli Salevetz, 13 Brighton Abattoir, Brighton, Mass.
Salem Commodities, Inc., 201 Fourth Street, Oakland, Calif.
Salinas Dressed Beef Co., Inc., Post Office Box 147, Salinas, Calif.
Edwin Salsburg, Lancaster Pike, Shillington, Pa.
Salter Packing Co., 4350 Alcoa Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Sambol Packing Co., Shawnee Street and Railroad Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
David Samiof & Sons, 130–132 River Street, Troy, N. Y.
Samett Packing Co., 5600 York Street, Denver, Colo.
San Antonio Packing Co., 2000 South Laredo, San Antonio, Tex.
San Jose Meat Co., Route 2, Box 635, Berryessa Road, San Jose, Calif.
San Mateo Meat Co., Post Office Box 54, 19th Avenue and Bayshore Highway, San Mateo, Calif.
Samuel Sandler Kosher, Sausage Manufacturing Co., 2207 North 30th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Santa Maria Meat Co., Route 1, Box 126, Santa Maria, Calif.
Schaake Packing Co., Inc., Route 1, Ellensburg, Wash.
Schaake Packing Corp., Post Office Box 32, Toppenish, Wash.
Schaffner Bros. Co., 15th and Reed, Erie, Pa.
John Schams, 2300 South Avenue, LaCrosse, Wis.
Charles S. Schaum, 3914 North 25th Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Schisler Provision Co., 801 John Street, Portsmouth, Ohio.
Jacob Schlachter's Sons Co., Inc., 2841 Colerain Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The William Schluderberg, T. J. Kurdle Co., 3800–3900 East Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md.
A. W. Schmidt & Son, Inc., 2136 Harford Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Charles J. Schmidt & Co., 2124 Harford Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
J. Fred Schmidt Packing Co., 253 East Kossuth Street, Columbus, Ohio.
Schmidt Packing Co., North Front Street, Niles, Mich.
Schmidt Provision Co., Matzinger Road, Toledo, Ohio.
J. J. Schmitt & Co., Inc., 175 Lewis Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
J. F. Schneider & Son, Inc., Box 481, Middlesboro, Ky.
Schneider Packing Co., 146 Victor, St. Louis, Mo.
A. D. Schnipper, 1002 Wood Street, Texarkana, Tex.
Schott & Co., Inc., 1703 Poydras Street, New Orleans, La.
Schrader's Meat Products, 651 Plymouth Avenue, Rochester, N. Y.
John Schramm & Son, 534 Plymouth Street, Missouri, Mont.
Michael J. Schulz, 1000 West Mineral Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Schuman Provision Co., 641 Kossuth Street, Columbus, Ohio.
Schwab & Co., 1101 Linwood Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Schwartz & Co., 1114 Wood Street, Dallas, Tex.
Schwartzman Packing Co., Post Office Box 1358, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
S. Schweid, 238 East Fifth Street, Paterson, N. J.
Scioto Provision Co., Daniel Avenue, Newark, Ohio.
C. C. Scott & Sons, R. F. D. 2, Wellston, Ohio.
Seabrook Farms Co., Seabrook, N. J.
Seattle Packing Co., 2203 Airport Way, Seattle, Wash.
Sebastopol Meat Co., Box 56, Sebastopol, Calif.
Sechrist Bros., Inc., 32 East Main Street, Dallastown, Pa.
Dave Segal, Blackfoot, Idaho.
Segal Dressed Beef, West 68th and Big 4 Railroad, Cleveland, Ohio.
Seiler's, Inc., 4051–59 North Fifth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Seitz Packing Co., Inc., 16th and Garfield Avenue, St. Joseph, Mo.
A. Seles, 110 57th Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Alfred P. Seligman, Inc., 416 West 14th Street, New York City, N. Y.
Sell Meat Co., R. F. D. 3, Johnson City, Tenn.
Selma Dressed Beef Co., Inc., Post Office Box 117, Selma, Calif.
A. C. Seman Sons, Box 23, Versailles, Ohio.
A. Servetnick & Sons, 420 North Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Seven Valley Beef, Inc., Cortland, N. Y.
F. J. Sewald Meat Market Co., Jefferson County, Festus, Mo.
John Sexton & Co., 500 North Orleans Street, Chicago, Ill.
Guy Shaffer, R. D. 1, Hooverville, Pa.
Shamokin Beef Co., South Fifth Street, Shamokin, Pa.
Shamokin Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 388, Shamokin, Pa.
A. Shapiro Beef Co., 12 Brighton Abattoir, Brighton, Mass.
Shapiro Beef Co., 139 New Market Square, Boston, Mass.
K. Shapiro Inc., 2800 Standish, Detroit, Mich.
Sam Shapiro Wholesale Meats, 1230 Bland Avenue, Dearborn, Mich.
Shapiro Packing Co., Inc., New Savannah Road, Post Office Box 119, Augusta, Ga.
F. W. Shattuck & Co., 30 10th Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Shaw Packing Co., 404 East Oakland Street, Tyler, Tex.
Shehan & Co., Inc., 2301 South Washington Street, Peoria, Ill.
Sheller Bros., Smithville, Ohio.
Shen-Valley Meat Packers, Inc., Timberville, Va.
Sheridan Meat Co., Inc., 194 North Main Street, Sheridan, Wyo.
Sherman Slaughtering Co., R. R. 1, Sherman, Tex.
Shonyos' Inc., Lydonville, Vt.
Shores Meat Packers, Telfair Road, Savannah, Ga.
Shreveport Packing Co., Inc., 1801 Kings Highway, Shreveport, La.
Shull & Trusdale Wholesale Meat Co., 1200 Leaphunt Street, West Columbia, S. C.
Meyer Shulman's Smoked & Cured Meat Co., 77 I Street SE., Washington, D. C.
Sieck Packing Co., Inc., 3660 Placentia Street, Riverside, Calif.
Jacob Siegel, 403–5–7 North New Market Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Siegal & Block Inc., 4905 Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
Siegal Bros., 518 Washington Street, Woodbine, N. J.
Siegal-Weller Packing Co., 4535 McDowell Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Hans Sierk Meat Packing Co., Post Office Box 946, Wenatchee, Wash.
Sierra Meat Co., 2424 South Fruit, Fresno, Calif.
Sigman Meat Co., Inc., 835 East 50th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
Siller Beef Co., 37 Ann Street, Kingston, N. Y.
Silver Lake Packing Co., R. F. D., Moscow, Pa.
Silver Falls Packing Co., Post Office Box 26, 9902 North Hurst Avenue, North Portland, Oreg.
Silver Hill Corp., Franklin and Harrison Streets, Riverside, N. J.
Silver Skillet Brands, Inc., 7450 North St. Louis Street, Skokie, Ill.
Silverman & Wexler, 3725 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Simon Meat & Provision Co., Inc., 309–315 North Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Sinai Kosher Sausage Corp., 3355 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Singer Bros., 2906 Southwest Second Avenue, Portland, Oreg.
Sioux City Dressed Beef, Inc., 1911 Warrington Road, Sioux City, Iowa.
Sixth Street Market, Sixth and Pine, North Platte, Nebr.
Skokie Valley Frozen Foods, Inc., 8135 North Monticello Avenue, Skokie, Ill.
Skyway Meat Packing Co., Inc., 71–75 Paris Street, Newark, N. J.
Sluss Bros., North Tazewell, Va.
Smallwood Packing Co., Middlefield, Ohio.
Fred Smalstig, 10 Sherman Street, Millvale, Pa.
Smelko Bros., Old Rainey Works, Mount Pleasant, Pa.
Smit & Son, Boyden, Iowa.
B. G. Smith, 72 River Street, Troy, N. Y.
C. B. Smith, Route 3, Parkersburg, W. Va.
H. A. Smith Markets, Inc., 2731 Dove Road, Port Huron, Mich.
Hubert H. Smith, 509 Young Avenue, Muskegon, Mich.
Lloyd C. Smith, Box 5636, Kenton Station, Portland, Oreg.
Malcolm Smith, 3721 Old York Road, Philadelphia, Pa.
Smith Packing Co., 1143 South E Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
Smith Packing Co., Chicago and Prospects Streets, Sioux City, Iowa.
Smith Packing Co., 807 Third Avenue North, Nashville, Tenn.
Smith Packing House, Mohnton, Pa.
Smith's Heat'n Serve Frozen Foods, Inc., 3303 Secor Road, Toledo, Ohio.
Smithfield Ham & Products Co., Inc., Smithfield, Va.
Smithfield Packing Co., Inc., Smithfield, Va.
Smithgall & Ging, 338 Court Street, Williamsport, Pa.
W. W. Snavely, 4207 York Street, Harrisburg, Pa.
Snell Packing Co., Inc., Route 3, Clovis, N. Mex.
Snider Bros. Inc., Blackstone Street, Wilkinsonville, Mass.
Snohomish Packing Co., Inc., Route 4, Snohomish, Wash.
Morris Snow & Co., 4070 Deming Street., Detroit, Mich.
Solano Meat Co., Post Office Box 728, Vallejo, Calif.
Somerville Packing Co., 20 Water Street, Somerville, Mass.
Glen C. Soper, 152 Freedom Street SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.
South Philadelphia Dressed Beef Co., Inc., 232–240 Moore Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
South Side Butchers, R. F. D. 4, Box 352, 3001 South Harding Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
South Side Packing Co., 6525 Hamilton Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
South Side Packing Co., Inc., 2259 South Muskego Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Southern Farms, Walkersville, Md.
Southern Food Co., 5 Lloyd Street, Baltimore, Md.
Southern Foods, Inc., 1616 Murray Street, Columbus, Ga.
Southern Hotel Supply Co., 1248 Fourth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
Southern Packing Co., Inc., South Lelia Street, Post Office Box 867, Texarkana, Tex.
Southern Packing Corp., 9 Newcastle Street, Norfolk, Va.
Southern Provision Co., Inc., 1944 Rossville Boulevard, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Southern Style Foods, Inc., Craighead Street, Nashville, Tenn.
The Southland Corp., 2828 North Haskell Street, Dallas, Tex.
Southland Provision Co., Inc., Orangeburg, S. C.
Southland Provision Co. of Florida, Inc., Palatka, Fla.

Southwestern Packing Corp., Box 1068, Harlingen, Tex.
Sparky's Packing Co., 800 West Eighth, Pueblo, Colo.
Spencer Packing Co., Box 488, Spencer, Iowa.
J. Spevak & Co., Inc., 116 South Central Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Spidle Meat Market, 739 Manor Street, Lancaster, Pa.
James T. Spinos Co., 31 Linden Street, Somerville, Mass.
Spitzler's Meat Products Co., Inc., North Gallatin Avenue Extended, Uniontown, Pa.
Spivack & Onorato, 1875 Main Street, Bridgeport, Conn.
Sprague Bros. Co., 135 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Spring Grove Packing Co., Inc., Spring Grove, Ill.
Springfield Beef Co., 202–208 Lyman Street, Springfield, Mass.
Springfield Meat Co., Inc., 2860 East Main Street, Springfield, Ohio.
Spungin's Abattoir, Inc., 330 South Cameron Street, Harrisburg, Pa.
Stadler Packing Co., Inc., 660 Belmont, Columbus, Ind.
R. W. Staffeld & Sons, 1237 William Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Stafford's Market, 608 14th Street, North, Great Falls, Mont.
Stahl-Meyer Inc., 172 East 127th Street, New York N. Y.
Stahl Packing Co., Inc., 326 Northwest Sixth Street, Evansville, Ind.
Standard Beef Co., 151 Cedar Avenue, Scranton, Pa.
Standard Beef, Inc., 2510 Orleans Street, Detroit, Mich.
Standard Foods, Inc., 729–731 South Eighth Street, Louisville Ky.
Standard Meat Co., 514 East Central, Fort Worth, Tex.
Standard Packing Co., Inc., 201 West North Street, Kokomo, Ind.
Stanko Packing Co., Sheridan, Wyo.
Frank A. Stanley Packing Co., 10171 Gravois Avenue, Affton, Mo.
August E. Stapf, 2524 Dulaney Street, Baltimore, Md.
Star Packing Co., 164 Esteben Street, Arabi, La.
Star Packing & Cold Storage Co., Sidney, Nebr.
Star Provision Co., 1200 Howell Mill Road, Atlanta, Ga.
Star Provision Co., Inc., 2327 First Avenue North, Birmingham, Ala.
Stark Wetzel & Co., Inc., 725 Gardner Lane, Indianapolis, Ind.
State Fair Provision Co., 316–330 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
State National Kosher Provision Corp., 82–86 Westerlo Street, Albany, N. Y.
State Packing Co., Inc., 3163 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Statesville Packing Co., Old Mocksville Road, Statesville, N. C.
Stauffer Packing Co., 306–308 South Main Street, Rocky Ford, Colo.
Stearns & Welch Meat Co., 4319 Northeast Columbia Boulevard, Portland, Oreg.
George H. Steele Packing Co., R. F. D. No. 2, Centerville, Iowa.
Steen Bros. Food Stores, 334 West Second Street, Albany, Oreg.
Stegner Food Products Co., 1026 Township Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Max Stein Beef Co., 4070 Deming Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Steinbach Meat Co., 226–228 North Main Street, Chariton, Iowa.
Steinbacher Packing Co., Woodruff Lane & Henry Street, Elizabeth, N. J.
Sam Steinberg, 990 Crescent Street, Brockton, Mass.
O. J. Stelling, Inc., 801 West 49th Place, Chicago, Ill.
Stephens Packing Co., 2120 Eton Avenue, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Sterling Boneless Beef Co., 705 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Sterling Packing Co., Box 87, Sterling, Colo.
Steuernagel Packing Co., 1325 South Brazos Street, San Antonio, Tex.
Stevens Meat Co., Gonzales, La.
Stock Yards Packing Co., Inc., 1107 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.
Stoeven Brothers, Post Office Box 716, Rio Vista Road, Dixon, Calif.
Stokely-Van Camp, Inc., 905 East Fourth Street, Fairmont, Minn.
Stokely-Van Camp, Inc., Post Office Box 1113, Indianapolis, Ind.
Stokes Canning Co., 378 Osage Street, Denver, Colo.
Harvey L. Stoltz and Raymond Matz, Bernville, Pa.
Stoppenbach Sausage Co., River Street, Jefferson, Wis.
Stor-Dor Service Packing Co., 621 West Ray Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
The Stouffer Corp., 3800 Woodland Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Straub & Smith, 5047 West Chelsea Road, Indianapolis, Ind.
Strauss Bros. Packing Co., 530 South Muskego Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Streck Bros., 401 West Washington Street, Belleville, Ill.
A. Darlington Strode, 337 West Union Street, West Chester, Pa.
Stumpf Brothers Packing Co., 3225 South Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
A. C. Stuebben, doing business as Stubgen's Meat Market, Isabell Street, Saxonburg, Pa.
The Sturgis Packing Co., R. R. 4, Kenton, Ohio.
Suber-Edwards & Co., 1508 West Washington, Quincy, Fla.
The Sucher Packing Co., 400 North Western Drive, Dayton, Ohio.
The Sugardale Provision Co., 1018 McKinley Avenue, SW., Canton, Ohio.
Summers Packing Co., North Liberty, Ind.
Sumski Harband & Sumski, Inc., 1510 Evans Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
Sunai Kosher Sausage Corp., 3355 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Sunflower Packing Co., Inc., 1200 East 21st Street, Wichita, Kans.
Sunny Dale Meat Products, 50 Van Buren Street, Nashville, Tenn.
Sunnyland Packing Co., Dothan, Ala.
Sunnyland Packing Co., Postoffice Drawer 191, Thomasville, Ga.
Superior Meat Products, Inc., 1700 Monroe Street, Gary, Ind.
Superior Packing Co., 4111–4119 South Union Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Superior Packing Co., 2103 Wabash Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.
Superior Packing Co., Postoffice Box 876, Broderick, Calif.
Superior Provision Co., Massillon, Ohio.
Superior Provisions, Inc., 1345 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Supreme Meat Co., Inc., 314 South 21st Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Survall Packing Co., 3207 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Swayze & Garey Packing Co., Edison, Nebr.
Swift & Co. (Neuhoff Packing Co.), 1307 Adams Street, Nashville, Tenn.
Swift & Co., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.
Joseph Switken Co., 134 West Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
Syracuse Packing & Prov. Co., Inc., 248 Walton Street, Syracuse, N. Y.
T & T Packing Co., Division Street, Macon, Ga.
T & W Packing Co., Chicago and Lafayette Streets, Sioux City, Iowa.
Wm. Taaffe & Co., Inc., 1536 Evans Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
G. H. Tabron, Route No. 2, Shinnston, W. Va.
Talmadge Farms, Inc., Lovejoy, Ga.
Talone Packing Co., West Washington and R. R., Box 728, Escondido, Calif.
Isaac Tamaren Beef Co., 1515 East Kirby, Detroit, Mich.
Tankersley Bros. Packing Co., 1017 Grand Avenue, Fort Smith, Ark.
Tannehill and DeYoung, Inc., Cass Street Road, Post Office Box 108, Traverse City, Mich.
Tant Packing Co., 831 Amarouth Avenue, Laurel, Miss.
Tarpoff & Co., 1428 Edwardsville Road, Granite City, Ill.
J. V. Taylor & Co., Wyalusing, Pa.
A. C. Taylor Packing Co., 164 Col Road, Mount Vernon, Ohio.
Taylor Meat Co., Idaho Falls, Idaho.
The Taylor Provision Co., 63 Perrine Avenue, Trenton, N. J.
Ted's Boneless Beef, Inc., 125 North American Street, Stockton, Calif.
Telfer Packing Co., Owosso, Mich.
Temptee Product Co., 4655 Washington Street, Denver, Colo.
Tenda Brand Frozen Foods, Inc., 176 Saddle River Avenue, Garfield, N. J.
Tennessee Sausage Co., Inc., 295 Southfield, Ecorse, Mich.
Tennessee Valley Packing Co., Carter Street, Columbia, Tenn.
Terry Foods, Inc., 700 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
The Teufel Bros. Co., 3325 West 65th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Texas Meat Packers, Inc., 5219 Secons Avenue, Dallas, Tex
Texas Meat & Provisions Co., 311 South Lamar Street, Dallas, Tex.
Texas Packing Co., 1119 Commerce Street, Houston, Tex.
Texas Tavern Canning Co., Fair Park, Seguin, Tex.
Theede Packing Co., Somonauk, Ill.
The Theurer Norton Provision Co., 3136 West 63d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Nick Thielman Sausage Co., Rhine Street, Elkhart Lake, Wis.
Thies Packing Co., Inc., Box 750, Great Bend, Kans.
Thies Packing of Dodge City, Inc., East Chestnut Street, Dodge City, Kans.
Thomasma Bros., 701 West Leonard Street, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Thompson Beef Co., 5437 12th Street, Detroit, Mich.
Tid-Bit Products Co., 17212 Miles Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Tieman Packing Co., Fort Morgan, Colo.
Timmerman Packing Co., North Yale and Dawson Road, Tulsa, Okla.
Titis Food Products, Inc., 175 Main Street, Agawam, Mass.
Tobin Packing Co., Inc., 900 Maple Street, Rochester, N. Y.
E. M. Todd Co., Inc., Post Office Box 76, West End Station, Richmond, Va.
Tog Packing Co., Inc., 1010 Clinton Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Tom Boy, Inc., 4353 Clayton Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Torrington Packing Co., Box 540, End of West C Street, Torrington, Wyo.
Trans World Refining Corp., 137 12th Street, Jersey City, N. J.
Traverse City Provision Co., Cass Street Road, Traverse City, Mich.
J. T. Trelegan Co., 41 Clay Street, Cambridge, Mass.
H. Trenkle Co., 1225–1227 Central Avenue, Dubuque, Iowa.
Trenton Dressed Beef Co., 53–63 Bloomsbury Street, Trenton, N. J.
Trenton Foods, Inc., 713–A Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo.
Trenton Packing Co., 58–72 Escher Street, Trenton, N. J.
John W. Treuth & Sons, 334 Oella Avenue, Catonsville, Md.
Tri-Miller Packing Co., Hyrum, Utah.
Triangle Meat Distributors, Inc., 440 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.
S. Triolo & Son, 1141 South Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Tri Our Steaks, 480 Slocum Street, Exeter, Pa.
Triplex Packing Co., Route No. 2, Box 80, Pueblo, Colo.
Trumbull Packing Co., Route No. 2, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Tru-Value Food Products, 309 Front Street, Santa Cruz, Calif.
Trunz, Inc., 24–45 Lombardy Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Turlock Meat Co., Post Office Box 586, Turlock, Calif.
Turner Bros., 123 East Osage Street, Nowata, Okla.
Turvey, Inc., Post Office Box 54, 103 Southeast Eighth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Turvey Packing Co., Blackwell, Okla.
Twin City Packing Co., Inc., Sixth and Cherry Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C.
Uddo & Taormina Co., 527 Chestnut Avenue, Vineland, N. J.
Uintah Packing Co., 400 North Vernal Avenue, Vernal, Utah.
William Underwood Co., 85 Walnut Street, Watertown, Mass.
Union Beef Co., Inc., 131 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Union Packing Co., 3030 East Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Union Packing Co., 3855 North Market Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Union Packing Co. of Omaha, 4501 South 36th Street, Omaha, Nebr.
Union Provision & Packing Co., 5138 Butler Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
United Beef Co., 140 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
United Beef Co., Inc., Park Street, Gaffney, S. C.
United Dressed Beef Co., Inc., 4360 South Soto Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
United Dressed Meats, 801 North Regal, Spokane, Wash.
United Home Dressed Meat Co., Ninth Avenue and 31st Street, Altoona, Pa.
United Meat Co., Inc., 3813 Cote Brilliante, St. Louis, Mo.
United Packers, Inc., 1018–1030 West 37th Street, Chicago, Ill.
United Packing Co., 20th Street, Benwood, W. Va.
Universal Beef Corp., 119 Newmarket Square, Boston, Mass.
Ursick Meat Co., 1414 Constitution, Pueblo, Colo.
U. S. Packing Co., 16 North Street, Boxton, Mass.
Fred Usinger, Inc., 1030 North Third Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Utah County Packing Co., Inc., 428 East 2 South, Provo, Utah.
Valentine Co., Inc., Post Office Box 356, Terre Haute, Ind.
Valentine's Meat Juice Co., 166 Chamberlayne Avenue, Richmond, Va.
Valley Meat Co., Box 263, Marysville, Calif.
Valley Meat Co., 123 South Yellowstone, Sidney, Mont.
Valley Packing Co., Post Office Box 1001, Pueblo, Colo.
Valley Packing Co., Post Office Box 1525, Farmington, N. Mex.
Valley Packing Co., 618 Commerce Street, San Benito, Tex.
Valley Packing Plant, Box 911, Livingston, Mont.
Valley Sausage Co., Post Office Box 581, La Grande, Oreg.
Valleydale Packers, Inc., of Bristol, Commonwealth Avenue, Bristol, Va.
Valleydale Packers, Inc., Eighth and Iowa Streets, Salem, Va.
William Van Alstine, Route 1, Box 140, East Lansing, Mich.
Van Brown Packing Co., 1700 North Yale, Tulsa, Okla.
Van's Packing Plant, Box 1902, Boise, Idaho.
Varano & Troutman Abattoir, Sixth and Oak Streets, Kulpmont, Pa.
Joseph Venexia & Sons, 601 Moore Street, Norristown, Pa.
Venice Maid Co., Inc., Boulevard and Montrose Streets, Vineland, N. J.
Frank Venuto, 407 North 66th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Joseph Venuto, 231–35 Tasker Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Verschoor Packing Co., Hospers, Iowa.
Vetter Meat Co., 817 West Lordiman Street, Kokomo, Ind.
Victor Meat Co., Inc., 331 Washington Street, Oakland, Calif.
Victory Beef Co., 557 River Street, Paterson, N. J.
Victory Packing Co., 3363 East Fourth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
Victory Beef Co., 2530 Scotten, Detroit, Mich.
Vienna Sausage Mfg. Co., 1215 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.
Vietti Foods Co., 701 Bradford Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
Viking Packing Co., Inc., 241 Mehle Street, Arabi, La.
Virginia Packing Co., Duncan Avenue, Virginia, Ill.
Virginia Provision Co., Inc., Walden Avenue 1745, Cheektowaga, N. Y.
Vogel's Inc., 121 South Second Street, Pekin, Ill.
Vogt Packing Co., 4309 South Dort Highway, Flint, Mich.
J. H. Vollmer & Sons, Bozeman, Mont.
John Volpi & Co., 5258 Daggett Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Volz Packing Co., 826 East Prairie Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Wabnitz & Deters, 765 West South Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Wagers Packing Co., 713 North San Jacinto Street, Houston, Tex.
Wagner Provision Co., 56 East Broad Street, Gibbstown, N. J.
G. H. Waldock, Inc., Neilson Avenue, Sandusky, Ohio.
The Waldock Packing Co., Perkins Avenue at Campbell Street, Sandusky, Ohio.
Walden Packing Co., Inc., Route 52, Walden, N. Y.
Walker Bros., 2579 Graham Avenue, Akron, Ohio.
Walker's Austex Chili Co., 310 San Antonio Street, Austin, Tex.
Wall Packing Co., R. F. D., Sturgis, Mich.
Wallabout Meat Packing Co., Inc., 108 North Sixth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wald, Baram, Inc., 89 South Market Street, Boston, Mass.
W. W. Meats & Provisions, Shackamaxon and Allen Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
Wallace Meat Co., 512 Cedar Street, Box 767, Wallace, Idaho.
Wallens-Byrne Packing Corp., 196 Guilford Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Walti Schilling & Co., Inc., P. O. Box 495, Santa Cruz, Calif.
Wampler Wholesale Meats, Inc., R. F. D. 2, Lenoir City, Tenn.
Wand & Co., Box 193, Slate Hill, N. Y.
Wardrup Packing Co. Inc., Letcher County, Box 36, Blackley, Ky.
W. H. Warren, 5873 Highway 70, Memphis, Tenn.
Warrington Packing Co., Inc., Chalfont, Pa.
Warsaw Sausage Co., 3711 Scoville Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Washington Packing Co., Inc., Box 753, Washington, N. C.
Watertown Abattoir, Inc., Watertown, S. Dak.
Waterman Packing Co., 73 North Third Street, Price Utah.
Watsonville Dressed Beef, Inc., Post Office Box 629, Watsonville, Calif.
Wayne Packing Co., 2520 Orleans Street, Detroit, Mich.
Wayne Packing Co., Inc., Front Street, Rittman, Ohio.
Weaver's Famous Lebanon Bologna, Inc., Post Office Box 525, Lebanon, Pa.
Webb Packing Co., Salisbury, Md.
Weber & Ritter Co., Inc., Post Office Box 54, Sumner, Wash.
Weber's Pickled Meat Products, 492 South 12th Street, Newark, N. J.
Ray Weeks & Sons Co., Inc., 6083 West 32 Mile Road, Richmond, Mich.
Weil Packing Co., 1700 Oakley Street, Evansville, Ind.
Weiland Packing Co., Inc., 493 Bridge Street, Phoenixville, Pa.
Weiler Packing Co., Inc., 11 North Main Street, Batesville, Ind.
C. W. Weimer, New Central Market, East Fourth and Bolivar, Cleveland, Ohio.
Weimer Packing Co., 225 McColloch Street, Wheeling, W. Va.
Weinstein Packing Co., Station B, Superior, Wis.
Weisel & Co., Inc., 2113 North Humboldt Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Weiss Packing Co., R. F. D. 1, Turkey Hollow Road, Dinora, Pa.
Well & Davies, Payette, Idaho.
Welsh Packing, Co., Box 1644, S. S. Station, Springfield, Mo.
Wenatchee Packing Co., Inc., South Wenatchee Avenue, Wenatchee, Wash.
Earl S. Wenrich, 566 Pennsylvania Avenue, Sinking Spring, Pa.
John Wenzl Co., 4300 Jacob Street, Wheeling, W. Va.
Charles Werkmeister, 716 Lapeer Avenue, Port Huron, Mich.
L. E. Werners Sons, 225 Main Street, Watsontown, Pa.
Wessel Brothers, 100 State Street, Belleville, Ill.
West Coast Meat Co., 9638 Madison Avenue, Castro Valley, Calif.
West & Ellender, Inc., M. R. H., Sulphur, La.
R. B. West Co., Inc., 1233 William Street, Buffalo, N. Y.
Western Boy Meats, Post Office Box 112, Yakima, Wash.
Western Cattle & Dressed Beef Co., 4773 Calhoun Road, Houston, Tex.
Western Meat Packers, Inc., 1300–1308 West Seventh Street, Little Rock, Ark.
Western Meat Packers, Inc., Post Office Box 387, Missoula, Mont.
Western Packing Co., 5747 North Peters Street, New Orleans, La.
Western Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 552, Toppenish, Wash.
Western Pork Packers, Inc., 288 Franklin Street, Worcester, Mass.
Weyhaupt Bros. Packing Co., 1510 Lebanon Avenue, Belleville, Ill.
J. L. Whisler & Sons, Inc., Post Office Box 553, Elkhart, Ind.
White Packing Co., Liberty Street Extended, Salisbury, N. C.
Whitehall Packing Co. (see Peters Meat Products, Inc., Chippewa Falls, Wis.).
Whitson Food Products Co., 1207 Oakland Avenue, Denton, Tex.
Wickham Packing Co., Inc., Post Office Box 286, Sapulpa, Okla.
Paul H. Wike, 116 North Robeson Street, Robesonia, Pa.
Wilder's Abattoir, Route No. 1, La Junta, Colo.
Wilkes-Barre Abattoir, 810 North Pennsylvania Avenue, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
Williams Packing & Storage Locker Co., 300 South Main, Miami, Okla.
S. W. Williamson, Turbotville, Pa.
Willo Packing Co., 120 North Sixth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Willow Brook Packing Co., Inc., West Chester, Pa.
Wilson & Company, Union Stockyards, Chicago 9, Ill.
John W. Wilson Sausage Co., Lewisburg, Tenn.
Winchester Packing Co., Inc., Hutchinson, Kans.
Winget's Market, Ithaca, Mich.
Winner Packing Co., Lock Haven, Pa.
Wisconsin Packing Co., 215 West Oregon Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Wisconsin Wholesale Meats, Inc., 2380 20th Street, Detroit, Mich.

James Witt Sausage Co., 77 I Street SE., Washington, D. C.
Wolf Packing Plant, R. R. No. 4, La Porte, Ind.
Wolfe's Meat Market, 105 North Center Street, Cumberland, Md.
Wolff Meat Co., 1325 South Brazos Street, San Antonio, Tex.
Wolf's Home Service, R. R. No. 4, Box 153, Belleville, Ill.
Wolin Packing Co., 3401 Michigan Avenue, Flint, Mich.
Wolverine Packing Co., 1340 Winder Street, Detroit, Mich.
Luther Wood & Son, Franklinton, La.
Roger Wood Packing Co., Post Office Box 612, Savannah, Ga.
Wood County Packing Co., Hart Avenue, Fostoria, Ohio.
Norman A. Wright, R. R. No. 2, Boonville, Ind.
Wright Packing Co., Baytown, Tex.
Wright Packing Co., 2510 Cleveland Avenue, National City, Calif.
Wuestling Packing Co., 3955 Garfield Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Wyandot Meat Products, Inc., R. F. D. No. 1, Nevada, Ohio.
Wyler & Co., 1050 Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Y. J. Packing Co., Post Office Box 57, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.
Yadkin Valley Packers, Inc., Post Office Box 187, Elkin, N. C.
John E. Youndt, Adamstown, Pa.
Young Bros., Prattville, Mich.
Young & Stout, Inc., Traders Avenue, Clarksburg, W. Va.
Young's Packing Co., Inc., 801 South Main Street, Decatur, Ill.
Delbert Zandbergen, Wilson Road, Route 1, Grandville, Mich.
Zanville Packers, Inc., Foot of Tyler Street, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Zeff & Co., Post Office Box 425, Modesto, Calif.
R. L. Zeigler, Inc., Post Office Box 351, El Paso, Tex.
Zeimmer & Zeimmer, Harlan, Ind.
Zenith Meat Co., 2501 Vernon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. (Safeway).
Zenith Meat Co., Nampa, Idaho (Safeway).
Zenith Packing Co., 5600 York Street, Denver, Colo.
Wm. G. Ziegler & Son., Main Street, Schwenksville, Pa.
Zimmerman Beef Co., 1200 Howell Mill Road, Atlanta, Ga.
Zion Kosher Meat Products, Inc., 482 Austin Place, Bronx, N. Y.
Zitron Bros., 219 South Muskego Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Geo. L. Zoeckler's Sons., 118 Bow Street, Wheeling, W. Va.
Zolmans Farm Market, Rural Delivery 3, Fredericktown, Ohio.
Sam Zubroff, 401 Sunbury Street, Minersville, Pa.
Jacob Zucker, 176 South Elliott Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
J. Zuman Abattoir, Oak Tree Road, Iselin, N. J.
Herman Zumstein, Inc., 3095 Colerain Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Zweigart Packing Corp., Pocatello, Idaho.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate and to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for the wonderful and excellent leadership he has given the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

As a new Member, I have been privileged to participate in the oil investigation, the steel investigation, and the investigation of the automotive industry. I say in all sincerity that the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has given not only great knowledge, but great impetus, to those hearings. As a new Member, I cannot help but express my admiration and my compliments on this occasion.

We all are deeply concerned with and interested in the evidence on administered prices in the steel industry brought out by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] during the Antimonopoly Subcommittee hearings.

Is there any doubt in the mind of anyone concerning the magnitude of that economic matter?

Is there any doubt in the mind of any economist that the United States Steel Corp. sets the price for steel commodities? And is there any question that after the price is set—economists are beginning to call it an "administered price"—some 25 steel companies move their prices up toward such price?

The same appears to be true in the automotive industry, although this is denied by the leaders in the industry. Three major automobile companies produce 96 percent of the products of the entire industry. The similarity of pricing on comparative models by these three majors is more than coincidental.

The tremendous influence of the major oil companies is admitted by all who have studied the record. Such influence also provokes the kind of questions the able Senator from Wyoming has been asking. Where is this Nation headed?

Only a few days ago a distinguished writer, Sylvia Porter, mentioned in a column on small business the topic of business mergers which are producing giant industries and squeezing out small companies. She, too, wondered in her column where this country is heading. She made some dire predictions and prophecies in her estimate of the situation.

As a new Member of this body I must say in all frankness I do not think the subject of monopoly is receiving serious enough consideration by either this body or the other body of the Congress. A few men work hard, as the able Senator from Wyoming has for over 20 years, in an effort to alert this Nation to what is happening.

Today we have a very serious and unprecedented economic problem confronting us. The cost of living has been increasing month by month, in a period of economic decline. We find that the durable goods industries are in great economic distress. Unemployment is increasing and spreading. Production of steel has been at 52 percent of capacity for months. But at the same time there is no price reduction in steel or automobiles or any of the industries producing durable goods which are controlled by the major giant corporations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have just received a message through the counsel of the committee, Mr. Don McHugh, from the Federal Trade Commission, which tells of an action today by the Giant Food Shopping, Inc., which proves every word I have been saying about the loopholes in the law which ought to be closed.

Let me read the message. I call this particularly to the attention of my friends in the press gallery who do me the honor of listening to this discussion. I will read it slowly:

On December 19, 1957—

A little more than 3 months ago—

the Federal Trade Commission ruled that Giant Food Shopping, Inc., was not a meat packer merely because it was grinding and mixing beef and pork into meatloaf and sausage. The case was referred back to the examiner for further consideration of the charges of price discrimination.

On March 21, 1958, last Friday—

When the pending bill became the unfinished business of the Senate—

Giant bought 100 shares of common stock in Armour & Co., with par value of $5 per share. Today, March 24, Giant Food Shopping, Inc., filed a motion to dismiss this case on the ground it now qualifies as a packer under the Packers and Stockyards Act, and therefore is no longer subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. This motion is based on the claim that under title 2 of the packer definition a company qualified as a packer if it is already engaged in the marketing of meats and then acquires ownership of any interest in the packing company.

If it is already engaged in the marketing of meats, and then acquires ownership of any interest, it becomes a packing company, and therefore exempt from the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Ask the stock raisers of Colorado, or Wyoming, or of any other State in the Union; ask the farmers who raise hogs, where they think they would get by buying 100 shares of Armour & Company's stock. What good would that do them in respect to their prices? But the purchase of 100 shares of Armour stock gets Giant Food Shopping, Inc., off the hook in relation to a charge of violation of the antitrust laws, price discrimination, and the like.

This is the most amazing confession I think I have heard since the Assistant Secretary, Earl Butz, honestly confessed before our committee that for 26 years the Department of Agriculture had not adequately enforced the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for bringing this matter to our attention. It only emphasizes the boldness, the brazenness of this group of people in negotiating such a transaction when the bill is under consideration and asking that they be exempted from possible prosecution under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

After listening to the message read by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I ask this question: Is the amount of the purchase sufficient to exempt them, under existing law, from possible prosecution under the antitrust laws?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I give a curbstone opinion to the Senator from Colorado. I do not believe that the purchase of such an amount of stock will be sufficient. However, the fact is that title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act contains this provision in section 201, which defines the term "packer." This

is one of the amendments that was written into the law by the lobbyists in 1921:

When used in this act—

The term "packer" means * * * any person engaged in any business referred to in clause (a) or (b) above.

The businesses referred to in clauses (a) and (b) above are the businesses—

(a) of buying livestock in commerce for the purpose of slaughter, or (b) of manufacturing or preparing meat or meat food products for sale or shipment in commerce.

My further answer to the Senator is that even though that loophole was created, it is the business of Congress to slam the door and close it now.

Mr. CARROLL. Did not the evidence adduced at the hearings show that 6 or 7 of the big food corporations, by using a similar device, had exempted themselves from prosecution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Colorado, tell the world that the gigantic food companies, the gigantic food chains, and the big packers want to take into their own hands, and out of the hands of Congress, all the constitutional power which the forefathers gave Congress to protect the public interest.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator from Wyoming say that, as the result of 6 or 7 large chains having put themselves in the packing business by virtue of the method of operation described, they are no longer subject to prosecution under the Federal Trade Commission Act?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not wish to rely upon a legal argument. I wish to make the provision a hard-and-fast law. By the bill before us we would repeal this definition of "packer," and by repealing it we would close the loophole. That would mean that the Federal Trade Commission Act would remain under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, which was established to enforce it.

Mr. CARROLL. And that was the condition which existed before 1921.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Wyoming that I wholeheartedly support the measure introduced by him and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], which is designed to strengthen the antitrust laws by authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to proceed against monopolistic and unfair trade practices of meatpackers. Everyone who has studied the meatpacking industry knows that it is one of the most important in the American economy, for it slaughters vast quantities of livestock annually. Livestock is a major source of income to the producer and supplies a substantial part of the diet of the Nation. Because of these facts the price of livestock paid to the producer and the cost of meat and meat products to the consumer are of vital importance. Since I represent many livestock producers, I am particularly aware of these problems. The American meatpacking industry traditionally has been dominated by a few large companies, and in terms of the total number of companies, this continues to be the fact down to the present day.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I are sponsoring an amendment to S. 1356 in order to give the livestock producer greater protection than he now has under the Packers and Stockyards Act from unfair and discriminatory practices by meatpackers and others.

Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator WATKINS, the sponsors of S. 1356, recognize that such an amendment is necessary if livestock producers are to receive a fair price for their product. As Senator O'MAHONEY has already pointed out, S. 1356 does not attack the enforcement record by the Department of Agriculture under title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act where its authority is directed against practices which occur on the stockyard. The Department of Agriculture has demonstrated that it is competent and well able to deal with the problems of the producer in getting the products of the producer to the market place. Therefore, it is my firm belief that S. 1356 would be strengthened by giving the Department of Agriculture jurisdiction over all livestock transactions whether they occur at the stockyard or off the stockyard. Accordingly, sections (j) and (k) of my amendment would broaden the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and permit him to regulate livestock transactions at country buying points and at auction yards.

I am basically and fundamentally opposed to the approach adopted by the Cooley bill in the House and which bill I understand has been adopted in full by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in the amendment he introduced on March 3, 1958. In my opinion, this bill is fatally defective because it perpetuates the existing jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture over merchandising activities of meatpackers. The record is clear beyond peradventure of doubt that agriculture has neither the competency nor the inclination to enforce aggressively the antitrust provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act against the marketing activities of the meatpackers, that is, after the livestock has been slaughtered and has entered into the various forms in which it is prepared for sale to the consumer. This is the principal business of the meatpackers. It is the area of their activities which they do not want exposed to the light of day. The meatpackers are diligently seeking to preserve the protective umbrella of the Department of Agriculture over these activities. Past experience has convinced them that they cannot afford to have the Federal Trade Commission conducting investigations of their practices in the merchandising of meat and meat food products. To accept the Cooley bill or the Dirksen amendment is to surrender to the meatpackers in the same identical fashion as the Congress deferred to the lobbyists for the meatpackers in 1921. The packer lobbyists succeeded in having written into the Packers and Stockyards Act the provision which conferred jurisdiction for the enforcement of this act upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

However, because of my belief that transactions involving the live animal are best regulated by the Department of Agriculture, I feel that certain other provisions of the Cooley bill are desirable. Therefore sections (l), (m), and (n) of my amendment cover, in substance, provisions which are found in section 2 of the Cooley bill and are included in the Dirksen amendment.

Section (l) of my amendment strikes out the last complete sentence of section 302 (a) of title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act. This sentence restricts Agriculture's jurisdiction to stockyards which are 20,000 square feet or more. Complaints have been brought to my attention of unfair trade practices which have been injurious to the livestock growers in those smaller stockyards over which the Department of Agriculture now has no jurisdiction.

I have received complaints from cattle producers in Colorado who were unable to collect large sums of money for sales made to dealers and market operators who purchased at country buying points and auction yards. These purchasers went into bankruptcy and the growers did not get paid. Such a situation could not occur if the Department of Agriculture were able to exercise the same degree of regulation over the activities of market operators and commission agents at country buying points and small stockyards as it now exercises over the posted stockyards.

Section (m) of my amendment is necessary to implement the provision already described which extends Agriculture's jurisdiction to transactions off the stockyard. Section (m) permits the Secretary of Agriculture to require persons operating off the stockyard to register in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

As section 311 of title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act is now written, dealers—who are defined as any person, not a marketing agency, engaged in the business of buying and selling livestock, on his own account, or an employee or agent of the vendor or purchaser—are not included among those categories of persons against whom the Secretary of Agriculture can take corrective action for certain improper activities. Section (n) of my amendment is intended to include dealers within the scope of section 311.

I note that the Packers and Stockyards Act in section 406 (b) empowers the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of his duties to request the Federal Trade Commission to make investigations and report in any such case. In examining the record of your hearings, Senator, I note that on page 60 there is a letter to you from Chairman John Gwynne of the Federal Trade Commission replying to your request for all instances in which the Secretary of Agriculture has requested the Federal Trade Commission to conduct any such investigation. In this letter reported on page 60 of the record, Chairman Gwynne noted that the

Federal Trade Commission minutes disclosed no such instance, and he stated:

A check has been made with senior staff members of this agency, who can recall no instance when such an investigation and report was requested, at least in the past 20 years.

Paragraph 3 of section 1 of the Dirksen amendment provides that when the Secretary of Agriculture determines it to be in the public interest, the Federal Trade Commission may institute a proceeding under this act. This seems to me to be a completely empty gesture in view of the past history of the Department of Agriculture in seeking the aid of the Federal Trade Commission. Not only is this an empty gesture toward effective antitrust enforcement, but it does violence to our concept of the Federal Trade Commission as an independent agency. Since the Commission is an independent agency, its jurisdiction should not be permitted to rest upon a determination by an executive department. In *Rathbun (Humphrey's Executor)* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 602 (1935)), the Supreme Court described the Federal Trade Commission as "a body which shall be independent of executive authority, except in its selection, and free to exercise its judgment without the leave or hindrance of any other official or any department of the Government." Under the Dirksen amendment, the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission will be subject to the leave of the Secretary of Agriculture.

S. 1356, with the amendments added by myself and Senator YOUNG, and which has been accepted by the sponsors, would now divide jurisdiction cleanly between the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission upon a logical basis of functions which can best be performed by each agency. The area of expertness of the Secretary of Agriculture, as evidenced in his experience, generally relates to matters involved in production and the initial sale by the producer. The Federal Trade Commission operates primarily in the sale or merchandising of commodities, that is, in sales to wholesalers, to retailers and to consumers. S. 1356 with the proposed amendment accomplishes precisely this result. If we are determined to secure effective and realistic antitrust enforcement, S. 1356 is the only way to do it. We must not permit ourselves once more to play into the hands of the major packers and afford them a haven from surveillance of their trade practice activities.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I again wish to pay my respects to the able and distinguished Senators from Wyoming and Utah for the tremendous amount of work they have expended in constructing the evidence and argument on this bill.

I am sincerely hopeful that the RECORD will be read by all who are interested in developing an effective antitrust program for the protection of the meat producer, the retailer, the wholesaler, and the consumer.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to make it plain that no packer, large or small, or other business firm engaged in wholesaling meat, nonmeat food or other products has anything to fear from the return of authority to prevent unfair trade practices to the FTC, provided their wholesaling and merchandising trade practices conform to the norms outlined in the antitrust laws, which are designed to maintain and foster price as well as product competition. Likewise, my support of S. 1356 should not be construed as an attack upon big business. Bigness, per se, is not to be condemned. In fact, much of the comforts of everyday living which we all enjoy is made possible by economies of production which only large-sized firms can achieve. Only when big business uses its superior bargaining power and economic resources in a manner not consistent with the public interest is it to be condemned.

S. 1356 HAS BIPARTISAN SPONSORSHIP

Mr. President, the public has come to expect and demand that Government reinstate, where possible, and maintain by law as much price and product competition as the public interest necessitates in those areas of the economy in which it works badly or where little of it exists. This public concern is reflected in the platforms of both political parties. It is a matter of bipartisan concern.

For example, the 1956 Republican platform declares:

The Republican Party has as a primary concern the continued advancement of the well-being of the individual. This can be attained only in an economy that, as today, is sound, free, and creative, ever building the new wealth and new jobs for all the people.

We believe in good business for all business—small, medium, and large. We believe that competition in a free economy opens unrivaled opportunity and brings the greatest good to the greatest number.

Republicans also at that time pledged themselves to "a continuously vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws"—page 7.

On the other hand, members of the Democratic Party at their 1956 convention pledged themselves to maintaining "competitive conditions in American industry," and likewise "to the strict and impartial enforcement" of the laws "designed to prevent monopolies and other concentrations" of economic power—page 18.

Thus both of our major political parties are committed to the objective of maintaining a free and expanding economy by fostering the growth of competition. For this reason, among others, I was happy to join with Senator O'MAHONEY in sponsoring S. 1356 in the Senate.

S. 1356 is designed to prevent unfair trade practices, and other unlawful restraints in interstate commerce by persons engaged in wholesaling or distributing meats, meat products, nonmeat food, and nonfood products. This it does by amending the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to return to the FTC jurisdiction over the wholesaling practices of the meatpacking and distributing industry, and by amending the Packers and Stockyards Act so as to eliminate the authority the USDA has not used to prevent unfair trade practices in connection with such wholesaling activities under title II of that act.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT OF 1921

In the years prior to 1921 and before passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the FTC's investigation of packers resulted in the filing of antitrust suits by the Justice Department against some five national packers. Apparently, rather than face prosecution, these packers signed a consent decree which since then has prevented them from dealing in 140 food and nonfood products, chiefly vegetables, fruit, fish, and groceries; using their distribution facilities for the handling of any of these 140 products; owning and operating retail meat markets, and dealing in fresh milk or cream. In effect, they agreed to get out of the grocery business.

In 1921, when the Congress was considering passage of legislation to regulate stockyards, the five national packers, who had signed the consent decree, were able to convince Congress that prevention of unfair trade practices in that industry should be transferred from the FTC to the USDA.

Regardless of the merits their arguments might have had in 1921, it is evident that 37 years of ineffective administration or nonenforcement of title II renders them completely valueless today. Experience, in my opinion, clearly indicates that the Congress made a mistake when it transferred authority to regulate trade practices of packers from the FTC, a specialized agency handling antitrust matters, to the USDA, which did not then, and does not now, have a separate regulatory agency.

Mr. President, a review of USDA experience in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act will make this conclusion more obvious. In June 1956, Mr. Millard J. Cook, who for 25 years—1929 to 1955—was employed by the USDA in the enforcment of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the last 10 years of which he served as the head of the unit doing this enforcement work, told the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee:

In the early years of the administration of the act * * * they [USDA] undertook rather extensive studies of the operations of packers. * * * They brought quite a few actions. But at that time they had 150 employees, and took on as many as 30 part-time employees. They had relatively a large appropriation. * * *

From 1921, when the act was passed, up until about 1928 or 1929, they [P & S Administration] were an independent agency * * * and they reported directly to the Secretary of Agriculture * * * in the late 1920's prior to my becoming an employee of the Division, it was made a Division of the old Bureau of Animal Industry (transcript, June 28, 1956, pp. 336–337).

When asked why this transfer of its status was made, Mr. Cook replied:

Well, I know only from comments that I have heard made. I was new in the organization, and the comments that were made were to the effect that the Secretary at the time was not favorable to the act. He disliked the act. * * *

And I think that some of the feeling of Secretary Jardine boiled over into the Bureau of Animal Industry, because thereafter there was not the inclination to go out and

initiate investigations of monopolistic practices (transcript, June 28, 1956, p. 379).

USDA HAS NOT SOUGHT ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS

In answer to questions of committee members concerning requests for funds made by the Packers and Stockyards Division during the 10 years he was head of it. Mr. Millard J. Cook replied as follows to the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly in June 1956:

I made many recommendations; yes. I usually met with a pessimistic approach that it was useless to attempt to get any more money and that the explanation given to me was that Congress wouldn't be interested in appropriating more money for us to do a better job than we were doing.

I think you will find in the Department's records that there are numerous recommendations for increased appropriations. There were innumerable oral conferences with my superiors on the need for increased appriations. * * *

I think there were a few instances in which my immediate superiors recommended increases, but then when it got into the hands of the budget people in the Department, they scaled down those increases (transcript, June 29, 1956, p. 366).

This indeed is a story of lack of concern by not only the superior administrative but also budget officials of the USDA. Recent experience by the Packers and Stockyards Branch in this respect also has been met by denials of adequate funds.

On July 6, 1956, I introduced S. 4177 in the Senate. The Senate Agriculture Committee to which it was referred requested a report from the USDA on July 10, 1956. In the meantime, the USDA's 1958 fiscal year budget request went to the Bureau of the Budget. Its request for new obligatory authority for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act amounted to $178,000 to be used for the purpose of posting additional stockyards under title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Not one dollar of new obligatory authority was requested by the USDA for expansion of its enforcement activities under title II of the act for the 1958 fiscal year.

Information given the committee by USDA officials, however, indicated that the Packers and Stockyards Branch requested additional new funds amounting to $200,000 for title II enforcement.

Notwithstanding this background, the USDA on December 21, after its 1958 fiscal year request had gone to the Bureau of the Budget, rendered a report recommending against enactment of S. 4177. In spite of this negative report on a bill to transfer title II authority back to the FTC, and in spite of the Senate subcommittee's hearings on the meat industry in 1956, the testimony of the USDA before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the 1958 fiscal year makes it plain that the Department did not, until S. 1356 was introduced, intend to pay more attention to the enforcement of title II.

On February 7, 1957, Mr. Roy D. Lennartson, Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, told the House Appropriations Subcommittee:

Although we have been criticized recently for not devoting some of the funds under this act to explorations into trade practices on the part of packers and others outside the yards, I think our policy has been sound in attempting first to use our funds to bring the impact or benefits of this act down closest to where the producer can obtain them (hearings, pt. 2, p. 946).

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee was told on May 22, 1957, by Assistant Secretary Butz that the Department of Agriculture would not make a supplemental request for title II funds, but that "we also anticipate requesting from Congress additional funds for administrating the act, particularly title II, in our next budget request"—hearings, page 368. However, the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959—page 323—indicates that the requested increase of $225,000 in funds for regulatory activities of the Agricultural Marketing Service "would be used to strengthen overall administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act." Then follows a table which, in my opinion, explains what is really meant by strengthening overall administration. The table shows that a total of 546 stockyards were posted and being supervised at the end of fiscal year 1957. It estimates that a total of 606 yards would be posted by end of fiscal 1958, an increase of 60 yards; and that by the end of fiscal 1959 a total of 736 yards would be posted, an increase of 130 yards over fiscal 1958.

Primarily, the requested increase for fiscal 1959 is to be used, as it was last year, for posting and supervising more stockyards. Major emphasis is to continue to be placed on producer-packer relations involving the buying and selling of live animals, but little or none upon the prevention of unfair trade practices in the wholesaling of meat, meat products, and other items sold by packers in interstate commerce as required by title II.

In a recent letter to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], Secretary Benson said that $75,000 of the $225,000 increase in appropriation asked for by the Department for the Packers and Stockyards Branch would be made available for title II enforcement. This does not mean, however, that the $75,000 will be used to prevent unfair wholesaling practices under title II since packers can be charged with unfair-trade practices with respect to livestock transactions under that title also.

Of the 36 cease and desist orders issued to packers under title II, for example, 28 of these were issued to packers for, first, refusing to pay producers for livestock purchased; second, defrauding farmers through incorrect weighing and grading of their animals, and third, discriminating against some producers in the purchase of livestock. Since the executive budget for fiscal 1959 indicates that $225,000 increase will be used primarily for the posting of an additional 130 stockyards during fiscal year 1959, it is to be expected that the $75,000 will be used at the new yards primarily to regulate livestock transactions which involve meatpackers rather than in the prevention of unfair wholesaling trade practices.

Can anyone really doubt, after reviewing this appropriation history as it concerns title II, that USDA plans for its vigorous enforcement do not continue by and large to be tentative and anticipatory, as they have been for 30 years.

ADEQUATE TITLE II ENFORCEMENT STAFF LACKING

By contrast with the vigorous activities in earlier years under title II, as described by the former head of the Packers and Stockyards Branch, responsibility for prevention of unfair trade practices by meat packers until recently not only under title II but under title III as well in Washington, D. C., was vested in the Trade Practices Section of the Packers and Stockyards Branch of the Livestock Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service. A separate and specialized Packers and Stockyards Act Regulatory Agency has long since been dispensed with. This trade practice section was staffed by two marketing specialists and a stenographer at the time S. 1356 was introduced. In October, 1957, it was renamed the Packer Section.

Neither one of these two marketing specialists, who now comprise the Packer Section, nor a single employee in any of the 20 understaffed field offices maintained by the Packers and Stockyards Branch is engaged full-time in title II enforcement. A review of the USDA's April 4, 1957, self-appraisal report on the Packers and Stockyards Act administration indicates, in addition, as does the Department's appropriation request for both the 1958 and 1959 fiscal years that the great bulk of the work of this Packer Section and the Packers and Stockyards Branch itself has been and will continue to be spent in title III enforcement—regulation and posting of stockyards. Any action taken under title II as concerns packer wholesaling practices will remain incidental to its title III activities at stockyards.

These remarks are not to be deemed criticism of the personnel of the Packer Section or of the Packers and Stockyards Branch itself. The personnel of that Branch are to be commended for their continued efforts to obtain more funds and to expand their title II activities involving packer wholesaling practices. These remarks, however, are meant to be critical of several national administrations except during the price control periods for the almost complete lack of action in the past to support the Packers and Stockyards Branch and thereby to comply with the Congressional mandate given the USDA in 1921 to prevent unfair trade practices in the meatpacking industry. The simple facts are that the Packers and Stockyards Branch has not been permitted to obtain an adequate enforcement staff for prevention of unfair trade practices in the merchandising of meat and meat products under title II of the act.

This self-appraisal report I have referred to states that—

The organization that is maintained in administering the Packers and Stockyards Act permits a high degree of flexibility in planning and conducting major investigations and in meeting the fluctuating demands of different district offices. This is because the entire field force may be actively utilized in such an investigation whenever necessary (p. 8).

This statement appears to be a self-directed gratuity rather than a fact, as is revealed by examination of Assistant Secretary Butz and Mr. D. M. Pettus, Director, Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service before the Senate subcommittee. Consider the following colloquy between these gentlemen and myself:

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Secretary, is it not true that in the Ogden, Utah, area you have 2 marketing specialists and 1 clerk—3 people to regulate 26 packers in 3 States, 12 of them in Utah, 13 in Idaho, and also 1 in Oregon?

Mr. PETTUS. Those are the people permanently assigned to that location. When we have an investigation under way, we frequently bring in people from other markets and from our Washington area and add to our staff.

Senator WATKINS. If they do not have any bigger staff in other areas than in this, what would you have to enforce the law where you are moving them from?

Mr. PETTUS. We leave a reduced staff.

Senator WATKINS. For instance, in Billings, Mont., you have 1 marketing specialist and 1 half-time clerk, as I get it, to regulate 5 packers in Utah, 3 in Idaho, 2 in Wyoming, and 11 in Montana—21 altogether. How in the world can you take anybody from that area to help somewhere else such as the Ogden, Utah, area if the others are manned in the same way? (hearings, p. 391).

At this point, Mr. Butz asked Acting Director Pettus to explain how a case 2 years ago in the Ogden, Utah, area was handled. In part, Mr. Pettus replied:

Mr. PETTUS. I cannot recall at the moment how many people we had locking into the particular transaction, but we try to operate it with as few people as possible because we are spread so thin, Senator (hearings, p. 392).

To which I replied, with the colloquy continuing, as follows:

Senator WATKINS. I recognize you are spread thin, and that is our complaint—that you do not have enough force to do the job in title II.

Mr. PETTUS. We agree with you, and I think that is pointed out.

Senator WATKINS. You have not had for nearly 36 years.

Mr. PETTUS. I agree with you, sir.

Senator WATKINS. We think that is a long enough trial period. * * * With all the problems that have been handed to Agriculture, we thought we would certainly find someone who would be glad to get rid of this matter of law enforcement in the field in which the FTC has a special interest by reason of the act of Congress creating it as an independent regulatory agency—a special arm of the Congress.

Mr. BUTZ. It is quite true for 26 years it has not been adequately enforced, but don't you think when the sinner confesses and resolves to do better he should be given a chance? (hearings, p. 392).

As a "confessed sinner," what has the Department of Agriculture actually done since Assistant Secretary Butz said it had resolved to do better? What has it done to streamline its enforcement agency, the Packers and Stockyards Branch, so that greater emphasis can be put on title II enforcement?

In answer to these questions, I regret to reply that it has done very little. Its recent reorganization efforts follow and reflect the nature of its appropriation requests for the Packers and Stockyards Branch. And what is that? The need for posting and supervising more stockyards, which is admirable in itself, but hardly a substitute for adequate title II enforcement as concerns packer wholesaling activities.

For example, in October 1957 the Trade Practices Section was renamed the Packer Section. The mere changing of a name, not backed by an effort to obtain enforcement funds at the departmental level, is no guaranty that this section will be any more able in the future than it has been in the past in preventing unfair wholesaling trade practices by packers. Especially is this true when one realizes that only 36 cease-and-desist orders have been issued to packers since passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act, of which only 8 were for unfair trade practices in the wholesaling of meat and meat-food products.

The Regulatory Audit Section was abolished and its functions given to two new sections—Stockyard and Stockyard Engineering Sections. Two other sections—Rates and Registration, and Scales and Weighing—were not affected by the reorganization. The important thing to note is that the names of all these sections clearly indicate that they are concerned primarily with regulating livestock transactions.

On February 5, 1958, this action was followed by an announcement "that enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act is being strengthened further by establishment of an additional Deputy Director in the Livestock Division for overall administration of the act in the Agricultural Marketing Service." What do the packers think of this reorganization move as a means of preventing unfair trade practices in the wholesaling of meat and meat-food products?

The National Independent Meat Packers Association put it this way in their February 11, 1958, bulletin:

On Wednesday of last week Secretary Benson publicly announced an action which in no way satisfies the demands of many meatpackers that the mechanism for proper enforcement of unfair trade practice violations be strengthened * * *. In the opinion of many who are qualified to pass judgment on this situation, this does not even approach an honest recognition by the Department that something more tangible and practical than this shift of emphasis is necessary to meet the requests of the industry that proper enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act be insured.

Another packer organization, the Western States Meat Packers Association, observed in its bulletin of the same date, follows:

This association does not believe that this change will do much toward increasing enforcement over fair trade practices in the meatpacking industry. It is merely a gesture, and any action taken by the Packers and Stockyards Branch will still be subject to veto by 4 or 5 people in the Secretary's Department, any one of whom can veto any recommendation of the Packers and Stockyards Branch.

In a few words, the Department admits that title II has not received adequate enforcement; yet, paradoxically, it has not asked for and will not ask for adequate appropriations to prevent unfair wholesaling trade practices by packers under its title II authority. Nor, by the same token, will it take adequate steps to improve its internal enforcement setup. Under these circumstances, what reasonably prudent person would not conclude that such responsibility should be returned to the FTC, where it was vested before passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921? Is not 25 or 30 years of inadequate enforcement a long enough trial period?

ENFORCEMENT OF TITLE II OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT HAS BEEN INADEQUATE

The Packers and Stockyards Act vests the Secretary of Agriculture with authority under title II to issue cease and desist orders to packers who engage in unfair wholesaling trade practices. A small number of such cease and desist orders, in and of itself, obviously is not a good indicator of whether title II in this respect has been and is being enforced. A small number of such cease and desist orders, however, do indicate nonenforcement in my judgment, in light of what I have said, when coupled with the growing volume of complaints of unfair trade practices by packers, in their merchandising or wholesaling activities, which due to lack of desire and facilities, the USDA has done little or nothing about.

No, to say the least, it is unlikely that the small number of cease and desist orders—eight in number since passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act—which have been issued to packers for unfair trade practices in wholesaling or merchandising meat and meat products can be attributed to any other fact than a longstanding and continuing display of noninterest and lack of real concern on the part of the USDA. Except for one issued in December 1957, the last one before that was issued in 1938—20 years ago. By docket number, those 8 cease-and-desist orders can be identified as follows: 418—1933, 419—1933, 420—1933, 440—1936, 476—1938, 477—1938, 580—1938, and 2272—1957.

In addition, the USDA has never issued a cease and desist order against a packer for engaging in unfair trade practices in the wholesaling or merchandising of nonmeat food or nonfood products, since passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act. This is the case in spite of the fact that 18.2 percent of the interstate shipments of the 4 largest packers by 1950 was composed of such products, and in spite of numerous complaints which witnesses said were filed with the USDA alleging unfair trade practices by packers in connection with merchandising such products, but which the USDA did nothing about.

These are the kind of unfair trade practices then which S. 1356 is designed to prevent. It is jurisdiction over the trade practices of packers in the merchandising or wholesaling field which S. 1356 would return to the FTC. Its purpose is to prevent the use of unfair trade practices by a packer to the detriment of other packers and food firms in the merchandising or wholesaling of meat, meat food and other products as well, which packers sell in interstate commerce.

In summary, I urge the passage of S. 1356, because 37 years of jurisdiction over packer activities in this area has not produced a quality of enforcement

which the public interest requires—and I mean the public interest, including producers, packers, and consumers.

I yield the floor.

## ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 24, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1984. An act to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to stay temporarily any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments.

## RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A. M.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, and in accordance with the last clause of Senate Resolution 280, as a further mark of respect to the late Representative GEORGE S. LONG, of Louisiana, I move that the Senate now stand in recess.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, and in accordance with the last clause of Senate Resolution 280, as a further mark of respect to the late Representative from Louisiana, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1958, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24 (legislative day of March 17), 1958:

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey.
C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky.
Bernard Gufler, of Washington.
G. Lewis Jones, of the District of Columbia
Robert Newbegin, of New Hampshire.
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Tyler Thompson, of Maine.
William C. Trimble, of Maryland.
Henry S. Villard, of New York.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 1 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Garret G. Ackerson, Jr., of New Jersey.
Ware Adams, of Rhode Island.
W. Park Armstrong, Jr., of New Jersey.
Rollin S. Atwood, of Maryland.
Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts.
Leland Barrows, of Kansas.
Frederic P. Bartlett, of New York.
Samuel D. Berger, of New York.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
Elmer H. Bourgerie, of Maryland.
Daniel M. Braddock, of Michigan.
Aaron S. Brown, of New Hampshire.
Winthrop G. Brown, of the District of Columbia.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut.
Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana.
William P. Cochran, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Howard Rex Cottam, of Utah.
John K. Emmerson, of Colorado.
Carlos C. Hall, of Arizona.
William O. Hall, of Oregon.
Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia.
Frederick Jandrey, of Wisconsin.
Howard P. Jones, of Maryland.
Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio.
William S. B. Lacy, of Virginia.
Robert McClintock, of California.
Thomas C. Mann, of Texas.
Edwin M. Martin, of Maryland.
Graham A. Martin, of Florida.
George A. Morgan, of the District of Columbia.
Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., of Virginia.
Joseph B. Phillips, of Virginia.
Harold M. Randall, of Iowa.
Hayden Raynor, of the District of Columbia.
William M. Rountree, of Maryland.
William Sanders, of Virginia.
Durward V. Sandifer, of Illinois.
Livingston Satterthwaite, of the District of Columbia.
Walter K. Scott, of Maryland.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Henry J. Tasca, of Pennsylvania.
Robert P. Terrill, of California.
Ben H. Thibodeaux, of Louisiana.
Ray L. Thurston, of Missouri.
Benson E. L. Timmons III, of the District of Columbia.
William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia.
David W. Wainhouse, of Massachusetts.
Woodruff Wallner, of New Hampshire.
Joe D. Walstrom, of Missouri.
Woodbury Willoughby, of Florida.
George H. Winters, of Texas.
Glenn G. Wolfe, of West Virginia.

Robert E. Wilson, of Arizona, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Harrison Lewis, of California.
William D. Moreland, Jr., of Oregon.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

Joseph B. Alexander, of Virginia.
James J. Blake, of New York.
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.
Anthony Cuomo, of California.
Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania.
Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Philip C. Habib, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Sherman F. Euler, of Indiana.
David D. Hoyt, of Florida.
Stephen Peters, of Virginia.

John C. Amott, of New Jersey, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

C. Arthur Borg, of New York.
J. Stewart Cottman, Jr., of Maryland.
Allen P. McNeill, Jr., of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Zachary P. Geaneas, of New York.
Henry Hunt McKee, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Paul L. Aylward, Jr., of Kansas.
Brady G. Barr, of the District of Columbia.
Eugene H. Bird, of Oregon.
Paul F. Canney, of Massachusetts.
Robert G. Cox, of New Mexico.
Edwin G. Croswell, of Ohio.
Harold T. Ellis, of California.
Gordon A. Klett, of California.
John D. Tinny, of Florida.
Robert E. White, of Massachusetts.

Joseph Basile, of New Jersey, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

John P. Blaine, of Alabama.
Michael Calingaert, of the District of Columbia.
Jack M. Carle, of Colorado.
Theodore B. Dobbs, of Virginia.
George B. Lambrakis, of New York.
Gerald Floyd Linderman, of Ohio.
Miss Elaine Diana Smith, of Illinois.
Thurston F. Teele, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Stephen M. Carney, of the District of Columbia.
Robert A. Lincoln, of California.
Miss Josephine Pasquini, of Michigan.
Howard R. Simpson, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Robert G. Caldwell, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert H. Cunningham, of Ohio.
Renze L. Hoeksema, of Michigan.
Orval B. Hopkins, of Maryland.
Griffith Jones, of Connecticut.
Deric O'Bryan, of New Mexico.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Richard W. Hale, of Florida.
Anthony L. Sileo, of Connecticut.
Paul E. A. Van Marx, of Connecticut.
John R. Vought, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard A. Cleveland, of Pennsylvania.
Darwin J. Flakoll, of Virginia.
Roger Goiran, of Maryland.
Edward L. McAllister, of Virginia.
Richard L. Ruffner, Jr., of Virginia.
Barney B. Taylor, of Michigan.
Robert Taylor, of Florida.
John A. Unumb, of Minnesota.
Raymond Villemarette, of Louisiana.
Dan S. Wages, of California.

### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

Claire A. Wilder, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Albert Fuller Dorsh, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)